

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXV. No. 4 }
WHOLE No. 617 }

July 23, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
{ PRICE 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	315-318
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Ireland and Hungary—More Work for the K. of C.—The State and Private Property— Catholic Relics in New York City.....	319-325
COMMUNICATIONS	325-327
EDITORIALS	
Don't Forget the Poor—Reflections on the Prize-Fight—"Dr. Congress" and the Physi- cian—In Which Class Are You?—The Presi- dent's Call for Disarmament	328-330
LITERATURE	
Father Fabian's Predicament—The Failure— Reviews—Books and Authors	330-335
EDUCATION	
Some Documents on the School Question....	335-336
SOCIOLOGY	
A Study in Contrast.....	336-337
NOTE AND COMMENT	337-338

Chronicle

Ireland.—The brutal attack of Orangemen on Catholics excepted, the week has been quiet. Sir James Craig delivered the usual July 12 oration in which he gave these reasons for accepting Lloyd George's invitation to conference:

Conference Week

First, he declared, if we did not go to the conference we would be misrepresented behind our backs. We would have nobody to say a word for us. Second, we are a small community on the face of the earth, and foreign countries, as well as our own dominions, would misconstrue Ulster if she stepped aside. She would be condemned in her absence and told, "You would not go to the conference, therefore you must be ruled out of court." Third, it gets into the minds even of some of our friends that we have something to give away. While I and my colleagues are there, there will be nothing to give away. Therefore, while it is distasteful to many of us, we are not going to flinch from what we consider our duty to the well-being of our own people in the North. Fourthly, did we not go to London it would create a bad impression, after the King's speech on Ulster soil.

This is all very interesting, in view of this significant passage from the London *New Statesman*:

Ulstermen and their friends did not hesitate to create large constituencies, when this improved the chance of Unionist candidates. The City of Derry had a Nationalist majority and, there-

fore, ceased to exist as a unit and was merged into the County of Derry, so that Sinn Fein Ireland might have the less excuse to regard it as a piece of *Hibernia Irredenta*. Queen's University, Belfast, a stronghold of Unionism, with 2,500 voters, was allowed to elect four members. Derry City, with 17,385 voters, was not allowed directly to elect even one. The result of this skilful gerrymandering is that 341,239 Unionist voters have elected 40 members, while 164,278 Nationalist votes have elected only 12.

On Thursday, July 14, Lloyd George and De Valera were in conference for two and a half hours. On Friday, July 15, the press issued this statement:

An official statement said a free exchange of views took place and the relative positions of the two leaders were defined. Lloyd George had an audience with the King following the conference and consulted afterward with his colleagues in the Ministry. Sir James Craig, Ulster Premier, has been summoned to London by Lloyd George. One of the South Ireland leaders said: "We are satisfied with the results of the initial conference." Art O'Brien, head of Sinn Fein propaganda in London, said the conference terminated "amiably." Lloyd George last night said, referring to his talk with De Valera: "I am certain we both did our best to secure peace. Let us trust that this opportunity to settle this old, bitter feud will not be lost." Sir Hamar Greenwood, Chief Secretary for Ireland, declared he believed a permanent settlement would result from the conference.

Speaking at the Liberal Coalition dinner held in London, July 14, the Premier said:

The less said the better at this stage, but there is this great fact, that Mr. de Valera, chieftain of the vast majority of the Irish race, has been in conference for nearly three hours with the Prime Minister of this country, discussing various methods and suggestions for the settlement of this long, long controversy, an old, bitter, wasteful feud, a feud in which there have been for ages long a number of disastrous blunders and endless opportunities lost.

Let us trust that this one will not be lost. I can only say, after the long discussion, that I am certain we both did our best to secure peace. Beyond that it would not be wise for me to go at this moment because we both have our difficulties to deal with.

Greenwood followed with these words:

I urge all lovers of Ireland, of peace there and elsewhere, to say very little about it just now. But may I say as Chief Secretary for Ireland that I have always been an optimist about that portion of the United Kingdom, and after the visit of their gracious Majesties to Belfast and the speech of the King, who spoke as the head of the Empire with a felicity of phrasing and a warmth of feeling toward the Irish people that evoked one of the most memorable responsive thrills throughout the Irish world, evoked also a determination, I believe, on the part of the public of these Islands and of the Empire and of the press of these Islands and of the Empire to seek at last if possible a permanent settlement of this age-long Irish question. I believe the maintenance of that unanimity of public and press is one of the

most valuable elements in removing old-time suspicion and will enable the door to be opened to what I, from the bottom of my heart, profoundly hope will be at last a permanent settlement."

De Valera's comment was:

The outlook is brighter than it ever was in history. I am sure that the atmosphere in England and Ireland is right for peace. The only thing that is necessary now is for us to get down to rock bottom. This is simply a private conference with Mr. Lloyd George, instead of a long-range bombardment, to see what can be done at close quarters. I should be very glad indeed to put the case before your people, but as I am putting it before the representative of your nation I think it unwise to put it before your public.

A second conference was held Friday, July 15. Shortly after De Valera left, Craig who had been summoned, met the Premier. They had not been in conference long, when the Dominion Premiers were called. This meeting over, Craig summoned his Cabinet from Belfast. Ulster is still irreconcilable, as is apparent from this despatch sent by Craig to a war memorial meeting held in Ulster:

You may rest assured that I will see to it that the Empire in whose cause they so nobly laid down their lives is not weakened by any action of mine. They trusted us to give nothing away and their trust will never be betrayed.

Meantime troops are being sent into Ulster to protect the harassed Catholics, and the Irish correspondent of the *New York World*, takes occasion to remark: "The continuance of the outbreaks and unprovoked attacks on the Catholics in Belfast are already having a salutary effect on English public opinion."

Just what influence Craig will exert in the final settlement, is unknown. The correspondent of the *Associated Press* wired on July 15 this rather puzzling message:

The present discussions are designed to find, if possible, suitable ground for holding a useful conference—one that might legitimately be termed a peace conference.

So far as the Dail Eireann's representatives are concerned, what Sir James Craig says to Premier Lloyd George is of no moment. Mr. De Valera invited representatives of the Irish minorities to confer with him in Dublin. Sir James failed to appear, although he previously had talked with the President. The Southern Unionists did appear and expressed their views.

Mr. De Valera considers the party of Sir James Craig thus was represented, because the Southern Nationalists consider the Southern and Northern Unionists of the same clan and the same policy.

By his failure to appear, Mr. De Valera considers Sir James forfeited whatever right he might have claimed to being an element in the situation as between England and Ireland; in other words, it is with Mr. De Valera he ultimately will have to deal. Only in Irish internal politics does Sir James, in Mr. De Valera's mind, continue to be a factor.

This, of course, is entirely unofficial, and it is probable that the message falls under the judgment expressed by De Valera on July 16, when he was asked his opinion on various reports about terms and so on. "We are pledged to secrecy. These reports are pure fabrications, out of the minds of their writers and are wholly unwarranted."

On Sunday, July 17, De Valera issued this statement:

The press gives the impression that I have been making certain compromise demands. I have made no demand but one—the only one I am entitled to make. That is that the self-termination of the Irish Nation shall be recognized.

That British papers are keenly alive to the importance of the Irish problem is apparent from such items as this taken from the *London Observer*:

Since the armistice we have had it repeated that Ireland is the real pivot of the world. Ireland is the pivot because unless that question now goes well there will be much less prospect of success for the American conference either on Pacific problems or on disarmament. That ought to be very plainly understood, and it is indeed obvious. . . . Mr. De Valera has made a deep impression of sincerity.

Rome.—The Italian press continues to discuss the Roman question, those problems, namely, which deal with the relations of the Quirinal with the Vatican. In

a summary review of the opinions of the most prominent Italian dailies, the *Osservatore Romano* refers to

The Roman Question

various points of view set forth on the question by journals of such different religious and political views as the *Messaggero*, the *Idea Nazionale*, the *Tempo*, the *Epoca*, the *Tribuna*, the *Giornale del Popolo*, the *Resto del Carlino* and many others. Though there are false opinions supported in some of the journals mentioned, the *Osservatore* notes that all agree on the two following points: that the Roman question exists, and that Italy, in her own interests must solve it. But it subsequently calls attention to a fact which Catholics throughout the world must remember. The *Osservatore* declares that the *Messaggero*, the *Idea Nazionale*, and the *Tempo*, witnessing the resumption of diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See, spoke of the utility of a similar course for Italy. But the case of the diplomatic renewal between France and the Vatican is not at all the same as the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Quirinal and the Vatican, between the Royal Government of Italy and the Sovereign Pontiff, Benedict XV. Before an agreement between the Quirinal and the Vatican takes place, it will be absolutely necessary to settle antecedent points of difficulty which did not exist in the case of France.

Plain as this simple statement is to all who understand the first elements of the Roman question, it had to be further explained in an article from the Vatican correspondent of the *Corriere d'Italia*. The writer in the *Corriere* puts the whole problem in a clear and simple light.

First there is the strictly Roman question. This consists in the necessity and obligation incumbent on the Pope to defend the full and age-long sovereignty of the Church and its effective independence in exercising it; and in the duty incumbent on Italy of recognizing that sovereignty in such a way that the Faithful of the whole world are assured that such and no other is the position

of the Pope. In 1870, after a long period of plotting, violence and persecution on the part of men like Cavour, Mazzini, Garibaldi, Victor Emmanuel II, all territorial dominion was taken away from the Pope. He was thus robbed of the guarantee of sovereignty and independence. Under changed circumstances, the Pope "may renounce claim to the actual thing which in old days formed the guarantee, but he cannot cease claiming something to replace it effectively, if the thing itself is not restored. And Italy is bound to restore that something."

This is the core of the Roman question. Besides this there is a second question which the writer in the *Corriere* calls the Italian question. This concerns the situation of the Church in Italy. To the ordinary and not too analytical observer, the position of the Church there may appear to be satisfactory. But the position is in reality a strained and anomalous one, and founded on expedients to make it workable and tolerable. As examples of this state of affairs the correspondent of the *Corriere* says that while the Religious Orders are generally left in peace, legally they have no existence, that the *Fondo del Culto* out of which the clergy is allowed its meager pittance is an anomaly. Besides these phases of the question which affect domestic policies, the correspondent quotes those affecting Italy's foreign problems. Almost all other nations have relations with the Holy See, either by the forms of the old concordat system, or in cases where there is separation of Church and State, by special arrangements founded on a spirit of mutual friendship and a respect for one another's liberty. Italy should be in a similar position, the more so that the Pope resides in Italy and in its very capital. The correspondent notes with satisfaction that the question is being studied with a far better understanding and appreciation of the case than has been possible hitherto. He concludes with a pithy sentence which puts the double aspect of the question in a striking form: "Italy should be moved to the solution of the first, the Roman question, not only by a profound sense of justice, but also by consideration of the necessity in her own interests, of settling the second, the Italian question."

Russia.—In an excellent paper contributed to the June *Studies* by Father Lambert McKenna, S.J., on "The Bolsheviks," after reviewing the progress of the Revolution up to last spring he gives a clear analysis of the present political and economic state of Russia. The government of the Soviet Republic, he shows, is a Communist oligarchy, composed of some 200,000 Bolsheviks, who got control when the Revolution began on November 7, 1917, and following a rapid series of decrees by which the last vestige of the Czar's government and of Russia's former economic system was swept away, promulgated the Soviet Constitution July 10, 1918, the salient characteristics of which are these:

**Bolshevism
Today**

Its unit is the Soviet, a council, municipal or rural. In the

towns it is constituted in the following way: Delegates are sent to it by the workers in each large factory in proportion to their numbers (small factories and workshops are grouped together for this purpose); secondly, by the workers of each Trade Union; thirdly, by the soldiers who may be in garrison in the town. The general population of the town, voting by wards (apparently by way of representing the consumers' interests), send delegates also, but only a very small number. The Soviets in the village or small country district are elected by the peasants.

All these Soviets, urban and rural, send (proportionately to the number of the people they represent) delegates to Provincial (Gubernia) Congresses, the Provincial Congresses sending in their turn delegates to the All-Russian Central Congress. The town Soviets—not the country ones—are also directly represented (in proportion to the number of workers they speak for) at the All-Russian Congress. There is also another grouping of town and village Soviet-representatives in Regional (Oblast) Congresses which are subordinate to, but not represented in, the Central Congress.

This All-Russian Central Congress is the supreme legislative and executive authority of the State. By means of its Executive Committee it appoints the eighteen People's Commissaries, each of whom is at the head of a Commissariat (Foreign Affairs, Military, Naval, Home, Justice, Labor, Social Welfare, Education, Post and Telegraph, Nationalities, Finance, Transport, Agriculture, Commerce, Food, State Control, Public Health, National Economy. These Commissaries are in fact the real rulers of the Empire.

No one has a vote but those engaged in "socially useful work," or who were so engaged before the Revolution, so all those who hire labor, or have an income or who happen to be priests or religious are disfranchised. Moreover the Soviets exercise arbitrary power in excluding undesirable voters.

The main problem facing the oligarchy now is how to get food from the country into the towns. For the peasants are largely averse to Bolshevism and they are very loath to feed the town Soviets. Besides the almost total breakdown of transportation facilities makes the problem graver still. All the large industries are nationalized and each factory is under the supreme control of one man assisted by advisory experts. Labor is conscripted by the State, when necessary, strikes are declared "illogical" and severely punished. Regarding the present state of religion in Revolutionary Russia Father McKenna, writes:

Towards religion the Bolshevik attitude is most lamentable, though no worse than that of the Mensheviks, the writers of both parties professing philosophic materialism and showing a bitter hostility to revealed religion. Lenin in the usual Socialistic manner speaks of religion as the opium used by the Bourgeois for stupefying the people. Naturally, too, the Jewish element in the Russian Socialistic movement is hostile to Christianity. On the other hand to attack openly the faith of "pious Russia" would be too dangerous. By law all citizens enjoy "liberty of religious and anti-religious propaganda."

Religion is, therefore, free, but no very definite and reliable information has yet reached us as to how far this freedom is a reality. We know hardly anything about the matter except that the churches are often crowded and that ikons are to be seen in most houses. Religion is not allowed to be taught in the schools—presumably, too, anti-religious teaching is also for-

bidden in them. As to what actually happens there is evidently much reason for anxiety. One of the obligatory school subjects is the theory and practise of Communism. It is at least probable that the teachers, whose interest it is to stand well with the authorities, do not confine themselves to the purely economic side of this subject, especially as the books written by its exponents are bitterly anti-religious. We know, too, that in many rural districts parents refuse to send their children to the new "atheistic" schools.

The author thinks that the greatest menace to the success of the Revolution will come from the peasants who number eighty-five per cent of the whole population. They seized all the big estates, divided up the land among themselves, and now they mean to keep it, notwithstanding Lenin's hopes of forming for them a system of "Soviet" and "communal" farms, and they strongly oppose requisitions from the "town proletariat." A second danger to the revolution is the great likelihood that the dictatorship of the Communists will not last. In summing up, Father McKenna finds in Russian Bolshevism many of the evils of the present-day capitalistic system of government. "In both," he writes, "centralization is pushed to the extreme; in both education and the press are forced into the service of the State; in both wire-pulling and 'wangling' are the highest statecraft; in both the solidarity of the family is impaired—in the one case subordinated to State interests, in the other often crushed by industrialism; in both law looks less to justice than to the interests of the ruling power, in both the highest and greatest things of human life, the things of the immortal soul, are ruled out as of no account."

Turkey.—The new Greek Offensive, which was begun late last month, has thus far resulted, after a setback owing to the Turk's recapture of the town of Ismud, in the retirement of Mustapha Kemal's line. On July 16 the Turks were forced to accept battle on the fortified line of Kutala, on the southern branch of the Bagdad Railway, southeast of Brussa, and on the next day the Greeks developed their offensive in Asia Minor in four directions.

The War with Greece

The offer of intervention made by England, France and Italy was refused by King Constantine. In his reply to the Allied representations, after expressing his thanks and his desire for peace he said:

Greece is convinced that in defending her secular aspirations and rights granted her by the Treaty of Sèvres in compensation for her sacrifices she is also defending the interests of the civilization of the world in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Straits. Conscious of the importance of her double mission, she is by the extreme exertion of her moral and material strength on the point of imposing the common decisions of the Allies, which were the original cause of her being sent to Asia Minor. This conception of her duty has led Greece to accept all the sacrifices and to undertake a fresh war against the Turks, who try to escape the application of the treaty. Military interests alone can now guide her conduct and decisions, and for these imperative reasons the Greek Government cannot accept the

advice of her great Allies, in spite of her ardent wish to do so, as any postponement of the offensive beyond the date fixed by the High Command must damage the Greek military situation and encourage the enemy to oppose stronger resistance to the behests of the Powers.

The Greek Government feel confident that the Allies will remember in their action as mediators the mission of the Greek armies which were substituted for Allied forces for the execution of part of the common program and which will be replaced after the cessation of hostilities by the whole moral force of Hellenism. When the new regime in the Near East requires safeguarding, Greece can maintain that part with honor, for she will easily be able to maintain the new *status quo* once the stipulated guarantees are rigorously applied and the measures taken which experience has shown to be necessary. The present Turkish resistance is due to the non-application of the disarmament clauses of the treaty.

Mustapha Kemal also practically rejected the offer of intervention by sending word to General Sir Charles Harrington that they could meet only on condition that Great Britain accepted the entire Turkish program, namely, the complete Turkish control of Constantinople, where the English are now virtually supreme, and the return of Thrace and Smyrna to Turkey. The Greeks say that Mustapha Kemal has issued the warning: "If the Entente sends troops to help Greece, she will encounter Russian Soviet troops helping Turkish soldiers."

According to a statement given out early this month by the Greek Legation at Washington, almost 700,000 Greeks have been massacred, deported or starved to death since the war with Turkey began. Half of the victims are said to be Greeks of Pontus and the others from the interior of Asia Minor. The report continues:

Atrocity Charges

American travelers and others just arriving from Samsoun, said a dispatch from Constantinople, report horrible details of the persecution of Christian populations in that region. The notorious murderous chief, Osman Agha, arrived at Samsoun the second day of Bairam, Turkish holiday similar to Easter, inaugurating his entry by the murder of ten Greeks. Then, surrounding the stores of the American Tobacco Company, he arrested all the Greek clerks, numbering about 800, and had them transported to an unknown destination. The Greek quarter was then surrounded and 1,500 other Greeks arrested and deported to the interior. The population of thirty other villages in the Samsoun region were massacred while they were being transported to the place of exile.

The Turks, according to dispatches from Paris, make counter-charges against the Greeks, asserting that, before the evacuation of Ismud, not only Turks, but Jews, were massacred wholesale. The Jewish quarter shared the fate of the Turkish, becoming the prey of flames. A French patrol remained in the town till the day after the Turkish entry, and succeeded in saving the lives of 4,000 men, women and children. The correspondent of the *Journal des Débats* telegraphs that American and French marines saved from Greek incendiaries the hospital and establishment of the French Assumptionist Fathers, where hundreds of refugees had gathered. He added that the Americans photographed 200 corpses shockingly mutilated.

Ireland and Hungary

HERBERT D. A. DONOVAN, PH.D.

THE traditional attitude of Americans and the traditional policy of our Government has been one of sympathy and support to the less fortunate people of other lands who are struggling for political and religious freedom. At some times our encouragement of such people has been more emphatic than at others. Probably the most spectacular demonstration of this feeling occurred in 1852, when Louis Kossuth, the leader of the ill-fated Hungarian national uprising of 1849, was brought here on a United States warship, and was received with the most extraordinary enthusiasm in all parts of the country. A recent article in *AMERICA* has succinctly described that memorable tour and the diplomatic and legal controversies connected with it. There are still living a few witnesses of those memorable scenes and their testimony is unanimous in verifying the wonderful popularity enjoyed here by the Hungarian "Governor," a popularity that was reflected even in the fashions of that day, when the "Kossuth hat" became an article of popular wear.

In seeking the causes of this widespread enthusiasm, we find it difficult to attribute it to anything save our instinctive preference for republican institutions and our national repugnance to the oppression of one people by another. For there were at that time practically no Hungarians in America, nor had they been connected in any way with our national development; neither had we any national or popular quarrel with their enemies, the Austrians and Russians. Our people knew only that Hungary had rebelled, had met with temporary success, had established a republic, had adopted a constitution for a modern democratic government, had guaranteed personal freedom in place of the old feudal restrictions; that then all these desirable achievements had been crushed by superior force from without, and the unfortunate people had finally been punished by bloody reprisals.

There has lately been in this country a national leader, like Kossuth an exile from his own country, where he also had been a participant in an unsuccessful revolution put down by superior foreign force and punished with bloody vengeance. He was not brought here in a government warship, nor received, as was Kossuth, by the Congress of the United States. Yet his reception by those who admire him and sympathize with his cause was wildly enthusiastic. And that cause seems upon examination to be in all respects as just and in many respects strikingly similar to the cause for which Kossuth roused such admiration. Can it be that the American people have changed in their ideals since 1852, or is the analogy of Ireland and Hungary not well understood?

Hungary, like Ireland, has played a long and honorable role in the history of Europe. For centuries after her people became Christians they stood as a bulwark

against barbarian Slavs and Turks. Their "golden age" was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, under Louis I, Sigismund, and Matthias Corvinus. They developed a strongly feudalized society, a powerful nobility, and an intense loyalty to their sovereigns. As these sovereigns frequently held also the thrones of neighboring kingdoms, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, and the Empire, the Hungarians or Magyars came into intimate contact with the peoples of those kingdoms. Moreover, their own numbers were never, save under Matthias Corvinus, equal to the tasks they had to shoulder in defending Christianity and civilization. So, it became their policy to extend their power by conquest, which they did with signal success, gradually acquiring dominion over the Danubian lands as far east as the Rumanian border, but at the same time laying the seeds of their future downfall in the jealousy of the conquered Slavs.

They were, like the Irish, a fighting race; and, like them, possessed of great reverence for family glory. Their social and political organization was much more aristocratic even than that of Ireland. "All the descendants of the first Magyar settlers . . . are called *nobiles* . . . and are possessed of special privileges—they are exempt from taxes, their persons are inviolable, and they are the only electors of the Diet." ("E. O. S."—"Hungary and Its Revolution.") There was a "great nobility"—according to Hazen, comprising not over 500 persons—and a "lesser nobility," of perhaps 700,000. These might be compared, respectively, to the ruling families of the Irish provincial kings, and to all the other descendants of the Milesians. One remarkable feature of Hungary's independence was her Parliament of two houses, believed to be more ancient than the English body so often called "The Mother of Parliaments." It was divided into the Table of Magnates, composed of bishops, barons, and counts of the kingdom, magnates by birth; and a lower house, the Table of Deputies, composed of deputies from the counties, representatives of the cathedrals and of absent magnates. The Latin language was used in the parliamentary proceedings. A "Golden Bull," issued in 1222, confirmed the privileges of "the people," i. e., the nobility, even more strikingly than did the English "Magna Charta" of the same period, and this was often afterwards enforced.

Such, in brief, was the Hungarian State when, a racial and political unit, it was able to hold the hegemony of East-Central Europe; when its great king, Matthias Corvinus, could boast in his epitaph

Conquered Austria attests my strength;
I was the terror of the world; the two Caesars feared me;
Death alone was able to subdue me!

But this "glory of the world" was destined to a swift and sad passing. Matthias died in 1487. His

death was followed by forty years of weak kingship and internal dissention, which not even the constant inroads of the ancient enemy, the Turks, prevented. Finally, on the fatal field of Mohacs, August 29, 1526, the young king, Louis II, and 20,000 of his army were slain, and Hungary, like Ireland, disappeared as an independent nation.

In point of fact, it was not the defeat of the Hungarians by Solymán the Magnificent that ruined Hungary, but failure to agree on a course of action. Two rival parties elected rival kings, and civil war ensued for twelve years. Eventually, Ferdinand of Austria secured the mastery of all the western part of the country, and the national party, who had chosen John Zápolya king, was overthrown. Thus the House of Hapsburg was established in Hungary, where it has kept its hold until this very year.

Hungary's experience with Austrian rule reads strikingly like that of Ireland with England. A scholarly, but certainly not partial historian, the former Austrian Ambassador at Washington, Baron von Hengelmüller, states in his book ("Hungary's Fight for National Existence" London, 1913):

For 200 years the records of Hungarian parliaments—for Hungary retained her parliament—are filled with complaints against the violation of the country's constitutional rights. . . . The undue influence of foreigners in Hungarian affairs, their appointment to offices and emoluments, subjecting of Hungarians to trial outside the kingdom, the exactions of the Imperial treasury, and, later on, the violation of [religious] rights were complained of.

Several times the people, or parts of them, rose in rebellion. The most noted of these rebellions were led by Tökölyi (1678), who even summoned the Turks to his aid; and by Rakoczy (1703), who took advantage of the great continent-wide war then being waged between Louis XIV of France and his enemies, to enlist the support of France in the Hungarians' cause. Rakoczy at first met with success; but, overestimating the resources of his people, and, being abandoned by the French, he was defeated. During these unhappy times, the population of the country declined from an estimated 4,000,000 at the time of Mohacs to only 2,300,000 at the end of Rakoczy's war; and of these latter, only 1,160,000 were Magyars.

Nevertheless, the resistance of the Hungarians did win important concessions from the Emperor Charles VI. In 1723, in order to gain their support for his "Pragmatic Sanction," assuring the succession to his daughter Maria Theresa, Charles included in that famous document an assurance that the union of Hungary with the Empire was only a personal union, in the person of the monarch, and that such monarch must be elected by the Hungarian Parliament and crowned with the crown of St. Stephen, after swearing to observe the Hungarian Constitution.

This guarantee the Hungarians steadfastly relied upon in their later struggles. On the strength of it, they

fought for Maria Theresa and were chiefly instrumental in putting her on the throne; but she rewarded them by slighting their national aspirations, and treating them as if they were objects of a "civilizing process" by Germans. Her son, Joseph II, attempted Germanization with a vengeance.

In 1784 he caused the Sacred Crown to be removed from Hungary. The German language was ordered to be the national language of Hungary. . . . After 1785 even the counties were to use German. . . . German was to be taught in every secondary school. . . . No one should obtain any post unless he spoke German. [Ginever, "The Hungarian Question"; London, 1908.]

How close a parallel is here to the treatment of Ireland by England, and in particular to the reward she obtained for supporting the Stuarts!

Joseph's efforts failed, and on his very death-bed he was obliged to revoke his most obnoxious decrees. After 1815, there was a great revival of national consciousness, and Magyar again became the national tongue. One of the first steps in the Revolution of 1848 was its adoption as the required language of the Hungarian Diet. To this step, Kossuth was at first opposed, as also to the idea of a republic; but events rapidly carried him along, and he accepted the post of governor, and directed as well as he could the armed uprising against Austria in 1849.

This war was forced upon Hungary by the attempt of the young Emperor, Francis Joseph, to abrogate by decree the "March laws" to which his father had the year before solemnly pledged the Government. The Hungarians, victorious at first, were finally overpowered when Russia came to the aid of her sister despotism. It is worthy of note that in this war, Austria attempted to raise the religious issue, as England and her spokesmen do today. She sent General Benedek, himself a Hungarian and a Protestant, to put it down, even as England now sends Talbot to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, and Strickland as General commanding Cork. Benedek declared, "This is a Protestant rebellion; it will never be put down until the Protestants are put down." Yet, of the Hungarian leaders, Horvath and Deak were Catholics; Kossuth and Gorgey, Lutherans; Szemere, a Calvinist; and the Ministry contained Unitarians and Schismatics.

One more conspicuous parallel must be noted. That is, that the Sinn Féin policy of refusing to recognize the English Government by taking part in it is the same policy that the Hungarian deputies to the Reichsrath of the Empire followed between 1861 and 1867. The Hungarian leader at the time was Francis Deak, and his masterly policy of passive resistance hardened the national consciousness, and, when re-enforced by the timely occurrence of the "Seven Weeks War," brought Austria to her knees, and made Hungary practically independent by the "*Ausgleich*" or Compromise of 1867. Is it idle to expect that the rightful will of a united Irish nation may achieve a similar happy ending, and that Americans, who so wildly applauded Kossuth, may soon, for better reason, applaud De Valera?

More Work for the K. of C.

JOHN B. KENNEDY.

EACH annual convention of the Knights of Columbus may well be considered a retreat, albeit a non-cloistered retreat, in the continuous crusade that is generally accepted as the fated career of these muscular champions of the Church. Last year witnessed the Knights' annual international gathering in New York on the eve of the departure of a selected company, representing every nation in which they operate, to pay homage to the Head of the Church and to demonstrate, on soil rendered sacred by American blood, the living impulse of democracy in a tribute to Lafayette, without whose timely aid these United States might yet be a part of the Empire on which the sun never sets, and on which peace, which is far preferable to empire, never seems to settle.

This year the Knights of Columbus meet in San Francisco, their first convention in the City by the Golden Gate. It is the thirty-ninth annual convention of the Order, and the memories of many who sit in this convention will go back to the day in New Haven in 1883 when a handful of brave men and true of Connecticut, representing the meager membership of the infant society, met to review the consequences of its birth-year and to plan the beginnings of that amazing growth in numbers and good works which is American Catholicism's most remarkable phenomenon.

Verging upon 800,000 and with immediate prospects of growth to and beyond the million mark, and with a record for solid achievement unsurpassed by any American organization, even by those more gifted with favors by the monetary and political powers that be, the Knights of Columbus owes to the careful encouragement of the Church and to the indefatigable labors of sound administration, the renown and influence it unquestionably possesses. Each task to which these Knights have set their hands has been well done. Before the war, long years before the war, they demonstrated their capacity for great things by building a fraternal insurance system which, in a sheer quality of business management, is unexcelled by any insurance organization, fraternal or commercial, in the world. The stern science of their system has never been denied the test of impartial investigators: the Knights have always taken the safest possible course by submitting their insurance *modus operandi* to professional actuaries not in any way affiliated with them.

To the Knights of Columbus can truthfully be attributed the signal success of Catholic fraternal endeavor in the field of applied benevolence, for now with an insurance membership of approximately 220,000, they have forever nullified the excuse of the weak-willed Catholic who was wont to plead that no organization within the Church could offer the fraternal advantages of many organizations without. Even insurance depart-

ments unsuspected of sympathy towards a Catholic society, the zealously impartial insurance department of Canada, as an example, are constrained to admit that the Knights of Columbus, is the strongest and best-administered organization of its kind.

Many and diverse were the opinions of the action of the Knights of Columbus in offering to give to the American Legion for public use a \$5,000,000 memorial building. The magnificence of the sum involved captured the imagination, rather than the intent of the proposal, which was simply an honest attempt to close out an honest trusteeship. Nobody was better aware than the men who manage the affairs of the Knights of Columbus that there were many charitable purposes to which the huge fund might be applied. And nobody was more aware of the impassible obstacle in the terms of the trust that the Knights of Columbus must expend their war fund on the men for whose benefit it was entrusted to them.

The offer was made in October and the American Legion's declination in April, and between months the needs of the disabled in the war, rose in sharp relief against a background of political campaigning and fine promises unfulfilled. The Knights, quite ready to abide by their original tender, which the head of the Legion, the brave and lamented Colonel Galbraith, described as the fairest and squarest offer he had ever known, received urgent and unprecedented demands for assistance. Their board of directors wisely decided to devote the funds to the care and education of disabled and other ex-service men. Perhaps the country will soon be bombarded with a "drive" for a memorial building, and in the end pay many times \$5,000,000 for something inferior to what the Knights, who have a happy knack of making a dollar go as far as its dignity demands it should, might have built. But this is not of immediate concern.

The public, however, should derive the moral that this great organization of Catholics plays always with its cards on the table and is ready and even eager to acquaint the public that gave it its fund with the manner of that fund's expenditure.

That fund provided recreation and entertainment and the creature comfort that made hardship tolerable to 5,000,000 men during the war; it provided the machinery that found livelihoods for more than 300,000 men after the war; it was employed to build a system of 128 evening schools that have graduated more than 130,000 men and women, principally fee-free ex-service men and women, into profitable positions. It is financing hundreds of young veterans through representative colleges and is instrumental in caring for some 25,000 men in hospitals. And it remains now in service, doing the work its donors intended it should do. When and where has the American public ever derived similar value from similar investment? And throughout, no service man has ever contributed or been asked to contribute one cent of his scanty pay for anything the Knights have been able to do for

him. With legions of critics the Knights of Columbus have not been criticized. Calumniated? Yes; but that is always part of the experience of honest men at the hands of those who do not understand honesty, and who cannot explain apparent good except by transparent evil.

Now the Knights, in launching their work for the safeguarding of American history and for the spread of popular knowledge concerning the cause and cure of tuberculosis, are carrying on their tradition of constructive work for America. Herbert Hoover, characterizing the organization as a "unique background of 800,000 men before which and by the strength of which great things can be enacted," was characteristically correct. The gentlemen who have been gaily minimizing the hard facts of American history, who have been seeing all things through spectacles especially designed to magnify the virtues of their friends, who happened to be America's enemies, will not have an open field for their favorite game of historical athletics. They and their works will be numbered and named, and through the Knights of Columbus-historical commission America will recover the truth that has been lost, stolen or strayed for these many years, and we shall not live in fear that some day some genius will discover that Columbus never discovered America but that Sir Francis Drake or some

other notable pirate in a pleasant little hunt for swarthy fellow-men happened to set foot on the American continent proper and bring to it the first Anglo-Saxon civilization.

These major activities, conjoined with the maintenance of the excellent educational work of the Knights of Columbus, provide a program that any organization, no matter what its strength, would find worthy of its strength. In addition there lies before the Knights of Columbus the multiplex path of subordinate and State council activities in varied charitable and educational lines; the weaving of a network of Christian effort that leaves uncovered no territory where this largest organization of Catholic men exists to stimulate the good deeds without which faith is barren.

The Knights, in their success, have aroused jealousies; but without these that success would be insipid, for it is part of our human frailty that our heartiest tributes are often those in which the heart beats the wrong way. The dispassionate observer is tempted to hope that the Knights of Columbus will always have the spur of others' alert envy (and this is not desiring their sin, for their ignorance hardly permits the offenders to recognize envy as sin) to urge them forward in their honest and efficient labors.

The State and Private Property

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

THE State has the right to regulate and limit, but not to abolish, individual ownership of material goods. This is the substance of the Catholic teaching on this subject. For an authoritative statement of this teaching we turn naturally to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on the "Condition of Labor." The following are some of his most important declarations:

Every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. Man is older than the State, and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State. The common opinion of mankind . . . has found in the study of nature, and in the law of nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practise of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being preeminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human life. Thus it is clear that the main tenet of Socialism, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit, it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth.

The first conclusion from these statements is that the State cannot justly confiscate private property. Whenever it becomes lawful for public authority to appropriate the goods of individuals for public purposes, justice requires that the owners receive adequate compensation. The question of adequate compensation is not in every case easy of solution, but there can be no doubt about the soundness of the principle.

The second principle contained in the foregoing quotations is that the State may not deprive the individual of the opportunity to become the owner of external goods. This opportunity, declares Pope Leo XIII, constitutes a right which is derived from nature, not from the State. It is said to be derived from nature because it is necessary for human welfare, for the welfare both of the individual and of society. Inasmuch as the State itself exists only for human welfare, it has no right to abolish or to prevent any institution or practice which promotes that end.

Does this natural right of the individual extend to all forms of property? In every modern community there are certain kinds of goods which the individual is not permitted to own. In many countries he may not own a railroad or any portion of a railroad; even in the United States he may not own the post-office, and in most of our cities he is not permitted to have any share in the ownership of the waterworks. Yet no Catholic authority has ever asserted that such public restrictions of private ownership are contrary to the natural rights of the individual. The reason is that these and similar instances of State ownership do not frustrate the end of private ownership, namely, human welfare.

In modern industrial conditions, an important distinction is easily drawn between the goods of production and the goods of consumption. The latter category com-

prises all those commodities that are used to supply human wants immediately and directly; that is, articles which come under the heads of food, clothing, shelter, and the facilities for recreation, amusement, education, and religion. The natural right of the individual to own goods of this kind may be asserted without qualification. Should the State deprive him of the exercise of this right it would clearly violate justice; for human experience and the qualities of human nature show conclusively that human welfare would be gravely injured were the State to become the exclusive owner of those things which men need in their everyday lives. To be sure, it is proper and sometimes necessary for the State to own and manage some of these goods, such as playgrounds, parks and libraries; but it has no right to exercise exclusive ownership over any of these things.

The goods of production are those whose immediate object is not the satisfaction of human wants, but the creation of other goods. Such are land, mines, factories, stores, banks, etc. In other words, land and artificial capital. The declarations quoted in a foregoing paragraph from Pope Leo XIII all refer explicitly to land, but they are equally applicable to the artificial instruments of production. For the arguments by which Pope Leo shows that State ownership and management of land would be detrimental to human welfare are equally effective to prove the case against State ownership and operation of artificial capital. Therefore, the individual has a natural right to own productive as well as consumptive goods, and the State would treat him unjustly were it to prevent him from exercising this right. Hence the conclusion which Pope Leo reaches that Socialism "must be utterly rejected."

From this principle, however, it is not to be inferred that the State violates individual rights or exceeds its proper functions when it owns and operates *some* land, *some* mines, *some* ships, *some* factories, or *some* railroads. Indeed, public ownership and operation may justly extend in some communities to all railroads, all public utilities, and all natural monopolies. How far it may properly go in this direction is to be determined partly by the nature of the goods in question, but mainly by the effect which its action has upon human welfare. Two principles are clear: First, Socialism must be rejected; second, the excesses of private ownership and control may properly be prevented by State ownership and management if no other remedy is adequate. But there is no more precise principle or rule than that of human welfare which can be laid down beforehand to determine just how far State ownership may be justified.

The right of private property, even where it is inviolable by the State, is always subject to public regulation for the common good. Hence the State may properly fix the charges of public service corporations, and of all other services when the owners are exacting an unfair price for such services. It is also justified in fixing maximum prices for the sale of commodities in similar

circumstances. It has a right to determine fair interest and fair rents. All these propositions were carried into practice in the Catholic Middle Ages, and are defended in every Catholic manual of ethics. When the Supreme Court of the United States a few weeks ago upheld legislation to fix fair rents for buildings and to prevent the eviction of tenants who were willing to pay such rents, its decision was in line with Catholic ethical principles, no less than with the provisions of the Federal Constitution. The fact that many lawyers and other persons criticised this legislation and this decision as an invasion of the rights of private property, merely shows how far modern business practices have departed from the principles of justice. The traditional Catholic doctrine on the limits of private ownership was stated many centuries ago by St. Thomas Aquinas. As regards the power of disposal, he said, it is right that a man should regard things as his own, but as regards their use, he should look upon them as common, in order that he may readily share them with others in time of need. In brief, the goods of the earth come into the control of the individual proprietor entailed with a superior claim held by the community. This claim can never be entirely extinguished by the private owner. To determine when and how far (within the limits of justice) it shall be utilized by the community, is a function of the State. The correct doctrine on this subject has been fairly well stated recently by a writer in the *Virginia Law Review*. He declares that "it is idle to talk about freedom of contract and the right of a man to use his property as he pleases. There is no freedom of contract, and the use of the property is not being made by the owner of it. It is the others who must use it. And the permanent needs of society as a whole require that they use it."

Is the State justified in directly limiting the amount of goods that a person may own, or the amount of income that he may receive? So far as theory is concerned, an affirmative answer cannot be conclusively refuted. The determining principle here, as always in the matter of ownership, is human welfare. In practice, however, there can be little doubt that this exercise of State control would be unwise, and indeed, unnecessary. All the important evils involved in excessive private fortunes or private incomes can be prevented through indirect methods of restriction, such as regulation of prices, rents, interest, and through various kinds of taxes. This brings us to the remaining form of State control to be considered in this article.

The State has a right to restrict the exercise and the profits of private ownership through taxation. It has been said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," but as a rule, the taxing power ought not to be carried to this extreme; for, as Pope Leo declares: "The State is unjust and cruel if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just." The State may properly limit business gains through excess-profit taxes, may impose heavy inheritance taxes, and raise progres-

sive income taxes to a high rate; but in these and in all other forms of taxation, it is limited by three principles of justice: First, it may not tax business profits at such a high rate as to deprive the capitalist of a fair or moderate return on his investment; second, it is not justified in imposing such a heavy tax on any class of individual incomes or estates as to violate the rule of proportional sacrifice as between one class of taxpayers and other classes; third, no tax rate should approach so closely to confiscation as to discourage the legitimately acquisitive desires and activities of individuals.

Catholic Relics in New York City

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

NEW YORK is the greatest summer resort in the world, and, almost needless to say, not a few of those who come to New York City every year are Catholics who would be glad to know of the interesting historical relics that bear a definite relationship to the old Catholic times. That is the reason for writing a few brief notes with regard to some of the curios in New York collections, that have very special associations with Catholic history.

Probably the most significant historical object in New York is the globe of Ulpius, which may be seen at the New York Historical Society (76th Street and Central Park West). This globe is dedicated to Cardinal Cervini under whose patronage it was made at Rome. The Cardinal was a well-known Renaissance scholar very much interested in geographical knowledge. He was elected Pope in 1555 and great things were expected from him because of his breadth of mind and wide interests, but alas! he died three weeks after election. It was for him that Palastrina wrote the famous "*Missa Papae Marcelli*," though the legend that the Pope had heard the Mass before his death and burst into tears over the beauty of its music is one of the very interesting stories of history that must now be allowed to find its way into the limbo of non-authentic narratives which are not true, in spite of their appropriateness to the situation for which they were invented.

The globe was made in 1542 and subsequently found its way to Spain, where it was discovered some years ago in a junk shop in a rather badly damaged condition and was brought to this country and restored to its present very satisfactory state. The map on it follows what is known as the Verrazano map made by the brother of Verrazano, the first white man to enter New York harbor (1524), a Catholic who probably caused Mass to be said on Manhattan Island by the chaplain of his ship. There is a tablet in honor of Verrazano in Battery Park erected by the Knights of Columbus not far from Castle Garden or what is now the Aquarium. Visitors to this historic spot should not fail to see the Verrazano memorial. On the globe of Ulpius most of North America above Florida is called Verrazano or *Nova Gallia*, that is

New France. The explorer was in the service of France and the name New France remained for Canada until that country came into the hands of the English. The globe is famous for presenting the line drawn by Pope Alexander VI in the latter part of the fifteenth century, to set limits to the territories of the Spaniards and the Portuguese, in the new world, and thus prevent wars. All east of that line belonged to Portugal, all west of it to Spain. It was this historic line that made Brazil a Portuguese country.

It is in geography particularly that historical curiosities of the olden time abound. In the American Geographical Society's building (156th Street and Broadway) there is a series of glass transparencies of forty-one maps typical of the development of geography down the ages. There is an excellent reproduction of the Hereford world-map made for the Cathedral at Hereford, England, in 1283, a copy of which may be seen in my book on the thirteenth century. In this, as in the old maps generally, the east and not the north is at the top, and in the center is Jerusalem. In the encircling ocean Great Britain and Ireland are conspicuous. As on the globe of Ulpius the map-maker did much more than merely present geographic outlines. The animals of the various countries are represented and important facts in their history indicated. On the Hereford map there is an animal with a human head and a lion's body; not far away is Noah's Ark, and the Golden Fleece, and Lot's wife turned to salt, and the site of Troy, though lost for so long, with the pyramids as Joseph's granaries. In India one of the inhabitants is shown with but one foot, though this is sufficiently large to serve as an umbrella for shelter from the sun. The Hereford map will probably help the student of geography to understand old maps better than any other. They are well worth the study. Stevenson in his descriptive booklet to these maps, issued by the American Geographical Society, says:

One may obtain a far more intelligible understanding of many of the medieval geographical myths and fables, as, for example, of the Alexander legends, or of many a story of the classical day, from a study of this map, than from the best-made modern map.

Among the maps in the Society's building is the Waldseemüller map (1507) in facsimile the size of the original, as issued by Father Fischer, S.J., who discovered the map in an old German library (1901). It was on this map that the word America was first applied to the new world. Here may be seen also a facsimile copy of the world-map of Verrazano, the original of which is in the museum of the College of the Propaganda in Rome. This formed the geographical basis for the globe of Ulpius, as we have said. The Old World continents, especially Europe and Africa are represented with an accuracy that is rather startling considering the early period of map-making, 1529, from which this comes. All the other old maps are interesting to teachers.

Visitors to the Geographical Society building should not fail to see the Hispano-American Museum and Library (156th Street and Broadway), which contains so many historical materials from Spain and the Spanish-American countries. There are many books here that were printed in Mexico long before the Massachusetts Bay "Psalm Book" (1638), sometimes said to be the first book ever printed in America. Next door to the Museum is the Numismatic Society's building, which contains a collection of Papal coins with the insignia of the Papal orders, as well as of the various orders of chivalry in the various countries of Europe during the Catholic times. The little Spanish church on the same block is one of the gems of ecclesiastical architecture in New York with beautiful stained-glass windows and a dim religious light that is eminently devotional. It contains many artistic objects, gifts from foreign lands.

The Metropolitan Museum is full of objects of interest to anyone who wishes to get a better appreciation of the old Catholic times. There are some fine examples of the primitive Italian paintings of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, which reveal the religious spirit of the time better than anything that I know. It would be worth while to go to the Metropolitan, ask to be directed to the room of the Italian primitives and spend an hour or more there. The greatest artist of the nineteenth century, François Millet, declared that the only real help that he had obtained for the development of his artistic aspirations had come from the primitive paintings in Italy. Nothing in France or even in Italy impressed him so deeply. It requires special taste and study to appreciate them, but they are eminently worthy of it. The room of the primitives is probably at once the best test of one's artistic taste and also affords ample opportunity for development of that taste.

Almost needless to say, the Metropolitan possesses besides these Italian primitives beautiful original examples of the very great Italian artists of the Italian Renaissance. Raphael's Madonna with St. Anthony of Padua is given a special place of honor, and deservedly, for it is one of the world's greatest pictures.

The Metropolitan has besides its paintings some great originals in statuary, a Donatello, a Della Robbia in tinted terra-cotta, some magnificent examples of wood engraving, some of the most beautiful tapestries ever made, and exquisite examples of lace from all the periods in all countries as well as some fine pieces of needle work. The history of the development of music, so intimately connected with church services, can be studied in the large collection of musical instruments of all kinds. There are, too, beautiful specimens of work in the precious metals done for ecclesiastical purposes. In a word the summer visitor to New York can spend just as many hours as he has to spare wandering through our museums and he will find no cooler place, as a rule, even on the hottest days of summer.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words.

A Correction

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the last sentence of the second paragraph of my article on "The State and the Family," (AMERICA, July 9), the word *latter* should be *former*. As the sentence was printed, it makes me say that the abolition of the family would be preferable to the abolition of the State, which is the exact opposite of what I had in mind. The mistake was made by myself, not by the editor or the printer.

Washington.

JOHN A. RYAN.

The Interest Problem

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Jones owns a farm, but has no means of developing its full resources. Some of his fields are untillable, because they need draining; some are exhausted and need fertilizing. His barns are too small to hold all his produce and to shelter all his implements. He has not tractors enough to work all his available acreage. He goes to Robinson, his neighbor, and puts the problem before him. "Lend me \$10,000, Robinson, to make the necessary improvements and I can not only double my production, but raise better crops." Robinson figures it all out and agrees, taking a mortgage as security. The rate of interest is six per cent.

Jones drains and fertilizes his fields, and enlarges his barns, buys tractors, etc., and both doubles and betters his crops. What does Robinson actually do in this transaction? He puts in Jones' hands a number of useful instruments, by means of which the latter fully develops the resources of his farm and without which he could not develop those resources. He really lends Jones drainage, fertilization, barns, tractors, etc., so that Jones makes more out of his farm and Jones' farm possesses greater value. Robinson gets as his recompense six per cent interest. Jones gets a better farm and an increased and better product, a small fraction of which he pays as interest to Robinson and out of which he also sets aside something to pay back the principal at maturity.

Be it noted that Robinson has not lent to Jones merely 10,000 bits of printed paper called dollars, but has turned over to him a number of utilities (values), for the purpose of enabling Jones to increase the utilities (values) of his farm. If Robinson's \$10,000 were mere bits of printed paper, they would be valueless, barren scraps of paper, and Jones would have borrowed in vain.

Money is no longer money when it is only bits of paper, like Bolshevik roubles. Bolshevik roubles are barren bits of paper, because they have nothing back of them. True money is the economic sign, seal and pledge of economic goods and its value is exactly the value of the economic goods which underlie and substantiate it. A nation's money is valuable just in proportion to the economic substance that that nation possesses, as the values in foreign exchange demonstrate every day.

Robinson is justly entitled to some part of the usufruct of his utilities, which he has put in Jones' hands for Jones' benefit, not merely because he has taken a risk, but because there is a true usufruct, and because he has conferred a true benefit. Nor can some share of the usufruct be validly denied Robinson, because he does not personally operate the instruments of the usufruct; for if personal operation be the sole title to the usufruct that would also extend to Jones, since he must have human and natural co-operators in his production.

To take a more palpable instance: If Robinson lends Jones 1,000 sheep to pasture and to shear under the agreement that both shall share alike in the usufruct of the wool which the sheep will grow, neither Jones nor Robinson, if personal operation be the sole valid title to the usufruct, is entitled to it, since

neither operates the growing of the wool—the sheep will do that, and mother earth will contribute the grass upon which the sheep grow fat. This reduces to its evident absurdity the contention that personal operation is the sole title to the usufruct. The exercise of a little common-sense in a concrete illustration, clearly shows that interest is not only morally, economically and socially justifiable, but necessary in any civilized society. Savages may get along without it, but they also get along without clothes.

New York.

CONDE B. PALLER.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am interested in the seemingly serious proposal of a distinguished professor to confine "interest-income" only to such interest on capital as one uses in one's own business. I take it that his thesis practically is that capital lent to others is sufficiently rewarded by being properly taken care of, and is not entitled to interest-income because such interest enables the capitalist to live without working, which in his view must be looked upon as immoral.

Try putting that thesis to any sensible, thrifty wage earner or salaried man who has no business of his own, but who has a savings bank account accumulated out of his own earnings, which he has laid by against a rainy day. The thesis tells him that according to the distinguished professor he ought to consider it a favor for the bank merely to keep his money safe, and that he is not morally entitled to the interest the bank pays him because, having no business, he does not use his capital in his own business. No matter that he may be saving it up to go into business later on; no matter that he may not ever wish to go into business, because he may not wish to endure the mental strain nor assume the risks of business. Would it be mere prejudice due to his status as a bloated capitalist with a savings bank account if he would wonder at the mental processes of those who sustain this thesis?

Suppose that as a business man I think it will be profitable to extend my plant, and go to the savings bank to borrow some money, because I haven't enough cash or its equivalent available to finance the whole project. Satisfied with my credit, the bank lends me its depositors' money. I am in competition for that loan with other business men. I pay interest and am glad to do so, because I anticipate making a larger profit than the interest amounts to. I pay that interest to lay my hands on immediate purchasing power that that loan represents, rather than wait until I can accumulate all of the cash and in the meantime lose the additional cash that I anticipate making through expansion. I have not been robbed by paying that interest, because it was an offer freely made on my part, and I have no complaint to make as a borrower.

My new plant gives additional employment to workers, so that wage earners as a class have no complaint at my paying interest. The additional product I produce either goes to supply wants heretofore unfilled, or it fills old wants at lower prices; so the consumer cannot have any complaint at my paying interest.

Whether the rate be high or low depends on the relative scarcity of money capital at the time I borrow it in competition with other business men. Interest rates rise because business men can use more money at a profit than lenders have to lend.

Now who should get this interest which has emerged from the above causes? The bank of course gets some of it to pay its expenses and in return for taking care of the depositors' accounts. But the competitive rate is more than enough to pay the bank what it must have to do business. What is to become of the difference that the borrower is anxious to pay in order to be able to use the funds? The difference is there, should the bank get it, or should the depositor get it? In actual practise, of course, competition arranges that matter, because the banks compete for depositors by offering interest to the deposi-

tor; and if they did not, the business man who wanted to borrow money would go direct to the owner of the money.

Whether his interest comes through the bank or from a direct loan, is the owner of the capital funds immoral in taking that interest, just because he happens to have no business of his own in which he can use it, or does not want to have any business of his own?

One would have to twist that depositor's moral sense pretty strongly to make him believe any such thing. Suppose the money lender were a widow who, through the foresight of her husband, had in her possession a fund accumulated during her husband's life time as a thrifty provision against want for his growing family. She would greatly neglect her family to go out "businessing" just for the sake of employing that fund in a business of her own, to say nothing of the risk of loss.

If it is immoral for such people to take interest which I offer for use in my own business, I suppose that I would have to be considered an accessory to the sin of others by making the offer. Fortunately, the Church itself takes interest on idle funds, and that gives the ordinary mortal a sure guide as to the morality of his own act in doing it.

Cincinnati.

ERNEST F. DUBRUL.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Father Judge's distinction between instrumental and principal causes (AMERICA, July 9), does not injure my argument, nor help his. If he wishes to call the non-rational factor the principal cause of the product and the human factor the instrumental cause, I have no objection. My only concern is to assert that I do not see how the mere ownership of a productive thing gives the owner a right to the product of that thing when the productive thing is not used or operated by the owner. Father Judge makes no attempt to prove that such a right exists. All he does is to assert that the owner of the cause has a right to the effect. If this is not a "bald assertion," then I do not know the meaning of these words. What I am seeking is precisely some argument to support the proposition that the owner of a productive cause necessarily has a right to its effect, even when he contributes no labor nor sacrifice to the production of that effect. The metaphysical defense of the right to interest, based upon the intrinsic relation between the productive good and the product, strikes me as utterly futile and gratuitous. It is mere question-begging.

When Father Judge declares that a limitation of property rights which would prevent the capitalist from receiving interest is unreasonable because it is "unjust," he is likewise begging the question. What he is required to prove is precisely that such a limitation is unjust.

When he says that this restriction of the capitalist's rights is "impracticable" he uses the only method whereby the legitimacy of interest-taking can be proved or disproved. It is the method which determines property rights in the light of human welfare. For human welfare is the sole end and determinant of all property rights. But Father Judge fails to prove that the limitation of property rights involved in the non-existence of interest-taking would be injurious to human welfare. He asks what is to be done with the 990 acres which the owner of 1,000 acres is unable to cultivate himself. The answer is, they can be leased by the owner to men who are willing and able to use them. The fact that he is not allowed to take rent from the users does not destroy his power of disposal as regards leasing, selling, or giving away. Therefore, if the owner wishes later on to use more than ten acres himself, he can do so by withdrawing the required area from the control of those to whom it has been leased, when the lease expires. The only power wanting to him is that of getting an income without working.

When I said that we should have a much better world to live in if owners of capital were to forego their claims to interest, I had in mind only the effect on human welfare if interest-taking were actually abolished. I still maintain the truth of this proposition. The method of bringing about the abolition, or the possibility of doing it at all, is quite another question. I doubt very much that it could be accomplished by the action of the State. And I have no hope that it will be brought about through voluntary renunciation by the owners of capital. But the moral question remains. It is simply this: What right has the individual capitalist to take interest? The fact that the State permits him to do so is not *per se* a justification any more than is State toleration of acts which are certainly immoral. The fact that capitalists generally are unwilling to forego exercise of the power to exact interest, likewise furnishes no justification to the individual interest-taker. The issue of justice is between the individual capitalist and the persons who pay him interest, whether these be borrowers of his money or consumers of the goods produced by his instruments of production. Father Judge has failed to refer me to moralists who have given this question "adequate discussion," and he has obviously not yet proved that "the liceity of interest-taking is thoroughly established."

Washington.

JOHN A. RYAN.

America and Haiti

To the Editor of AMERICA:

To the untold suffering of the Haitian people for the last six years a new and even more terrifying chapter is to be added. The Occupation is about to put through a *twelve-fold* increase in the land tax. The avowed purpose of this tax is to accomplish "improvements," irrigation chiefly, but it is clear that it is designed largely to cover up the squandered revenues of the nation for the last six years and to make a belated attempt, now that the world's attention is focused on Santo-Domingo and Haiti, to make up for the absence of any constructive work during the American Occupation hitherto. This new tax will have no other effect than to dispossess the small landowners of Haiti, the humble peasant class, which forms the backbone and the overwhelming majority of the Haitian population. These people have held their land, handing it down from father to son, for over a century since the founding of the Republic. Though they suffered in consequence of the Occupation, they at least felt themselves safe from starvation and utter destitution as long as they held their land which enabled them to raise foodstuffs to support themselves. This new tax, which they will be unable to pay, will mean nothing more nor less than that the lands will be forfeited to the "State," which means the American Occupation, and then be purchased by American corporations for a mere song.

The Haitian peasant is already heavily taxed. He pays \$3.00 export duty for every hundred pounds of coffee. And it should be remembered here that while before the Occupation the American dollar was the equivalent of the Haitian gourde the Occupation arbitrarily reduced the value of Haitian currency by four-fifths so that the present tax in dollars represents five times its equivalent before the Occupation. Haitians pay \$1.75 export tax on each hundred pounds of cocoa; \$1.50 per thousand pounds of log wood; \$3.00 per thousand feet of mahogany; \$1.50 per thousand pounds of cedar.

It will of course be given out by the Occupation that this new act of oppression has been put into effect by President Dartiguenave. It has. The President and his Council of State are the mere rubber stamps of the Occupation. Even they learned through bitter experience what it means to oppose the wishes of the overlord, when their pay was held up and they faced not only the loss of the shadow of dignity which their office

gives them, but the prospect of seeing enacted whatever measures the Occupation desired to put into effect. Of course the recently re-established martial law, which subjects any critic of the Occupation to trial by court-martial with consequent fine and imprisonment, is effective in preventing the protest against the pending taxation which every Haitian burns to express. He knows that this impossible tax will be even more impossible of payment when he is in jail, and the assurance of the loss of his land thereby infinitely multiplied.

The Haitian people are in despair. They earnestly appeal to all that is best and noblest in American sentiment and in American public opinion to end the miseries inflicted upon them in the name of the American people.

New York.

STENIO VINCENT.

Illiteracy and Education

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In certain Southern States, thirty-five or more years ago, the problem of illiteracy began to attract the attention of Senators and Congressmen from that section of the country. On Thursday, February 26, 1885, the Hon. Thomas Hardeman, Representative from Georgia, rose in his seat in Congress and aired his views on a bill, S 398, "To Aid in the Establishment and Support of Common Schools." Plainly even in that early period, the Southern Representative saw the wonderful possibilities of obtaining Federal aid to put the population of the South, especially Georgia, on a par with the more fortunate people of the North. Representative Hardeman concluded his speech thus:

If then, it be the policy of this Government to build up an educational system in the States, I pray you to inaugurate one which will embrace moral culture, industrial training, and technical knowledge, for upon this system alone can be built the superstructure of a people's greatness and a nation's prosperity.

Apparently, judging from the conclusion, the subject of Federal aid was even at that distant period perplexing the saviors of the youth of the country and, of course, as at the present time, the watchful sentinels of the Government "pork barrel" had in mind several available outlets.

But on March 3, 1885, at the same session, Representative J. W. Throckmorton of Texas controverted the idea of Federal supervision and answered Representative Hardeman's conclusion this wise:

In my judgment the bill (S 398) *threatens the integrity of our republican institutions.* (Italics inserted.) The highest prerogative of political sovereignty is the right of the community possessing it to determine its political relations at pleasure, and upon its own judgment. . . . Let the local communities study and painfully appreciate their educational wants, and then, by taxation, or other adequate means, conjoined with the individual help of the citizen, in his private capacity, and aided by philanthropic men outside the commonwealths, address themselves to the solution of the question.

Relief will not long be delayed, and when it comes, it will be permanent, it will be healthy. No impairment of the simplicity and harmony of our splendid governmental system will be made in order to accomplish this result, and there is no State that cannot, meanwhile, "bear the ills" that it has not heretofore been able to cure. (*Congressional Record*, Appendix 1885, pp. 154-5.)

And there are many who re-echo the above statements in the present period of the country's history. There were partisans of the same tendencies as those who congregate in Washington today, in the political circles of the Washington of 1885. But then the aims were probably progressive in the right sense. Today the aim suggests selfish aggrandizement for a select clique.

Lowell.

GEORGE O'DWYER.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, July 23, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at Special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Don't Forget the Poor

AS a rule, Catholics give generously. But there are exceptions; Catholics who forget that to support their pastors is a duty, not a work of supererogation, and that to help Christ's poorer brethren, according to their means, is a real obligation. The point is well illustrated in an anecdote quoted in the *Living Church*, which tells how a prominent church member attended a mission, and coming out, dropped a ten-dollar bill in the box, and then went home, full of satisfaction over his generosity. He told his wife of his good deed, expecting approbation. Instead, she said something like this: "Well, Jim, you think yourself a fine fellow, don't you, putting just \$10 in that box? You have just paid \$250 for a victrola, \$125 for a suit, \$135 for your month's club expenses, and are about to make a trip that will cost you \$50 a day. You are generous."

"Jim" hardly merited this castigation, for under the circumstances he had done pretty well. But when Mrs. Caudle had concluded, "he went back to the mission and put in \$50," and at once the bread began to float to him across the waters. For on the way home from church he met a man whom he had not seen for years, and who owed him money. The debtor had made a pile, and handed him something he was not to look at just then. It proved to be \$1,000, much more than the amount of the debt.

Now, not many of our Catholic people are taking summer trips which will cost them \$50 a day. Most of us, however, are probably spending a little more than usual in these vacation days for our comfort and amusement. Let us not forget Christ's poor, even during vacation. There are thousands of hard-working men, exhausted mothers, and frail little children, who never have a vacation, but must remain all summer in the crowded, sweltering city. To increase our donations to charity in proportion to what we expend upon ourselves, is good policy. Our generosity may not face us with a man who owes us \$1,000, and is ready to pay the debt. But it will

bring us infinitely more than that paltry sum, payable in the golden coin which secures our entrance to the Kingdom of God. So Our Saviour has promised, and He will infallibly keep His promise. Whatsoever we do in His name to the least of our brethren He will take as done to Himself.

There is no vacation from the Ten Commandments, and there is no time in which we cannot lay up for ourselves treasures in heaven by helping the poor. Perils to body and soul lie in wait for the summer traveler, and he is a wise man who buys insurance from Him who has promised life everlasting in return for a cup of cold water, given in His Name.

"Dr. Congress" and the Physician

NOT content with the drastic provisions of the Volstead act, the faithful sons of the desert now offer the Campbell-Willis bill, a measure which makes Congress a Federal medical director. The American physician has fallen upon evil times; he is the most distrusted of all the distrusted at Washington. He may think that a pneumonia or influenza patient needs a pint of whiskey every ten days, or possibly oftener. But "Dr. Congress," as Senator Wadsworth says, knows that he is wrong. Whatever the physician may judge best, or even absolutely necessary, for his patient, he will at once turn into a criminal should he prescribe other than according to the direction of Congress.

Of course, as Senator Wadsworth reminded the Senate, any such proposal is "pure fanaticism." One "may gravely doubt," with the conservative Senator Lodge, whether the attempt by Congress to write the physician's prescription "be constitutional." The Eighteenth Amendment, as Senator Knox informed the Senate, bans alcoholic liquors for "beverage purposes" only, while the Campbell-Willis bill "puts into the Amendment something it was never intended to contain." No doubt the bill is both unconstitutional and fanatical, but despite decisions to the contrary that is also true of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead act. Yet the first is now part of the Constitution, technically at least, and the second is on the statute-books.

With the Volstead law showing the way, any invasion of an American's most cherished liberties is possible. In New York, for instance, some very precious constitutional rights are daily violated, and the people look on with the indifference of cowed children. A judge on the bench recently charged a jury to the effect that while the police might not invade a private house without warrant in search of the Demon Rum, they were free to invade semi-public premises or any place of business. Otherwise, he very truthfully remarked, the law could not be enforced. But a law that cannot be enforced without destroying a fundamental right is very much like the imperial edicts which roused James Otis and lost a continent to Great Britain. But Otis was an American and spoke to Americans.

Frankly, there is not much hope of defeating the Campbell-Willis bill. It is unconstitutional and fanatical, but we set the precedent when we adopted the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead act, thereby giving the Federal Government power to forbid the exercise of a personal habit as innocent as coffee-drinking or a corn-cob pipe. The right of the physician to prescribe what he thinks best for his patient is now to be destroyed. The fanatics can for once give a good reason for their position. "Otherwise the Volstead law cannot be enforced." The use of wine for religious purposes will be the next right to go. True, the Eighteenth Amendment does not forbid that use. But neither does it forbid a physician to prescribe an alcoholic medicine for his patient.

Reflections on the Prize-Fight

ON taking the oath of office, the Chief Justice of the United States swears that he will administer "equal right to poor and rich." Every judge, State and Federal, takes the same oath. That so much crime goes unwhipped of justice is not always, or even generally, the fault of our magistrates. It is not their duty to lie in wait for the criminal, for they are neither detectives nor pursuivants. They arraign the accused, sift the evidence, charge the jury and pass judgment. That is the beginning and end of their high office.

But our courts are always under fire, and one of their severest critics is the present Chief Justice. Yet with all respect for the opinion of an authority so eminent, may it not be said that the fault lies in the reluctance of the public to have crime punished rather than in the slowness or incompetence of our courts? Or if not reluctant, is not the public so indifferent that the police know they may safely wink at crime, and district attorneys feel that they are not desired to urge with vigor many of the cases which are presented?

In every American city there is an amount of serious disorder which the public tolerates. New York at the present moment offers a most pointed case. For some months a divorce proceeding has occupied more space in the daily papers than any affair of international importance; more, even, than the Jersey prize-fight. Both parties to this disgraceful contest seem tarred with the same stick. If she can prove that her husband has been guilty of an offense against public morality which is punishable by prison sentence by State law and Federal statute, the wife will win. Similarly, the husband will be granted a decree if he can show that his wife has been guilty of the same offense with which she charges him. The outcome of this case will be watched with considerable interest. If the wife establishes her charges, will the State or Federal authorities at once proceed against the guilty husband, and endeavor to send him to the penitentiary? If not, why not? Or will all the charges be quashed and the case settled out of court, to spare the feelings of a colony of multimillionaires?

If many of our Protestant preachers are to be credited,

the prize-fight at Jersey City was the worst blow ever dealt against American civilization. Perhaps it spells the return of paganism. But we doubt it. The most undoubted signs of paganism in this country are the low esteem in which the most sacred obligations of husband and wife are held; the readiness with which the Protestant churches connive at divorce or bless adulterous unions; and the ease with which any rich man may establish a harem and escape not only the heavy hand of the law, but even public censure. In comparison with these horrible evils now rampant in American society, a prize-fight is a public blessing worthy of ecclesiastical encouragement.

It is reported that the reforming societies now contemplate the impeachment of the Governor of New Jersey for the crime of attending a prize-fight. They will do infinitely more in the cause of public morality by camping on the trail of the guilty party or parties ground out by the divorce mills. One rich man or woman sent to the penitentiary for violation of his or her marriage-vows will clear the atmosphere far more effectively than a thousand laws against the cigarette, the prize-fight or the harmless but useful glass of beer.

In Which Class Are You?

IN the preface to "A String of Sapphires," Mrs. Eden's admirable life of Our Lord, written in verse for children, the author well observes:

In this world there are, and always will be, four classes of people. The first, and largest, class consists of those who do foolish things badly; the second and third classes (which cancel each other out with mathematical exactitude) consist of those who do foolish things well and of those who do wise things badly; and the fourth and last class (which is very small indeed) consists of those who do wise things well. Most Catholics (it is on the whole a comfort to reflect) belong to the third class—that is, we are well-principled but inartistic; art being, as St. Thomas says, neither more nor less than the right way of doing things. However, as long as we have a virtual monopoly of the last class (which is worth all the rest put together) we can afford to be hopeful, if not complacent. Our course is clear. We must work as hard as we can to get rid of the two lower classes altogether, and to raise ourselves and all the household of the Faith into the highest class of all.

So perfect is the foregoing classification that there is no one living who cannot be neatly tucked in just where he belongs. Since all sin, according to Holy Writ, is downright folly, and every sinner is a fool, and even the best of us offend in many things, the vast majority of the human race find themselves, at least intermittently, in the first class. "Those who do foolish things well," seem on consideration, however, to outnumber "those who do wise things badly," for the common run of men have far more success, for instance, in amusing than improving themselves. In the third class too the dilettanti and the smatterers will always be more numerous than the true artists and honest workers, so pitiful are our achievements compared with our aspirations. But there is great comfort in the thought that we Catholics enjoy "a virtual

monopoly of the last class," "who do wise things well." For the Church is the only institution in the world that not only claims to produce those consummate artists in well-doing, the Saints of God, but that actually holds up for the wonder and imitation of the Faithful throngs and throngs of them. The Catholic Church, and she alone, can proudly point to innumerable men and women, youths and maidens, boys and girls, who have been so successful in modeling themselves on the character of Our Divine Saviour and that of His stainless Mother that the Church, protected from error by the Holy Spirit, can infallibly proclaim that these distinguished children of hers, by doing "wise things well," at last made themselves experts in holiness and became saints.

The President's Call for Disarmament

THE call for disarmament has been sounded in Washington. It is a cheering sign in a world still shadowed by the after-war gloom, that the nation in a position to follow up a policy of might and steel should be the first to take the step toward permanent world peace. For no nation is stronger than is our own today. We have the raw materials that go to make the sinews of war, we have millions of men who have had military training, and Europe is our debtor to the sum of billions of dollars. If the American people here and now were determined to play the game of militarism they could set the pace and make the other nations of the world follow. But it is to the credit of the President that he has sensed the feeling of the nation. The rank and file of our people were sincere when they gave their all in the war that they truly believed was a war to end war.

They were disappointed when their wishes were not written into the Treaty of Paris. Their disappointment was recorded at the polls. They would have nothing to do with a covenant that was drawn up by diplomats

for the benefit of a few nations. They wanted a league of nations and not a league of diplomats with secret understandings explaining fair words in the interest of politicians and not of peoples. And the President has been the first to take a step forward toward a real league of nations. One action is stronger than fourteen paragraphs. A definite proposal for disarmament puts the question of international peace on a practical basis. It is America's challenge of practical idealism to the other nations of the world.

It is well to remember that even in the heat of war another voice spoke as the American President speaks today. On August 14, 1917, Benedict XV issued his appeal to the leaders of the belligerent peoples to come to an agreement "upon the following points which seem to be a basis of a just and durable peace":

First of all the fundamental points must be that the material force of arms be supplanted by the moral force of right, from which shall arise a fair agreement for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armament, according to the rules and guarantees to be established, such armament being maintained as is necessary and sufficient for the preservation of public order in each State. For armies should be substituted arbitration with its noble function of preserving peace, according to the rules to be laid down and the penalties to be imposed on a State which would refuse either to submit a national question to arbitration or to accept the decision rendered.

Following his proposition for real disarmament based on "the supremacy of right" the Holy Father advocated "the true liberty and community of the seas, which would diminish the numerous causes of conflict and would also open to all new sources of prosperity and progress." The sound and practical reasoning contained in the Pope's proposal was lost in the din of war. It found no place in a peace of conquest. And yet its first requisite "simultaneous and reciprocal disarmament" must form the basis of any practical and permanent peace.

Literature

FATHER FABIAN'S PREDICAMENT

FATHER FABIAN was in a predicament. Reputed to be the best chanter—and that too in a monastery renowned for its gifted chanters—in the entire Cistercian Order, he was wont to intone the Psalms of the Divine Office with such mellifluous devotion that the Faithful would come from far and near to hear him. When his sweet and powerful voice rang out above the voices of all the other monks at Compline, as the *Salve Regina* was sung, it seemed that Our Lady's praises were being sounded by no mortal tongue but by a burning Seraph strayed from Heaven. As the words "*O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria*" were reached, even the Lord Abbot, a hard-headed, unemotional man, was often seen to brush a furtive tear away, while most of Father Fabian's brethren found by experience that it was wise to bring to choir and tuck away in the corner of their misereres an extra handkerchief to hold to their streaming eyes while he expressed his intense longing for Heaven as he sung the words, "*Gementes et flentes in hac lacrimarum valle*." As for the devout Faithful who filled the nave

of the abbey church when Vespers and Compline were chanted, so moved were they by Father Fabian's celestial voice that the soft splash of their tears on the stone pavement could often be distinctly heard.

Now the quondam Father Fabian found himself in rose from the fact that he was quite as remarkable for his winning humility as for his melodious chanting. The prestige his abbey enjoyed, he could not avoid realizing, was chiefly due to his beautiful voice. On his account throngs came, he knew, to hear even the Little Hours chanted, and many a dying noble, as Father Fabian was well aware, had left rich legacies to the monastery under the express condition that no one should sing their Requiems but him.

Now keenly as this gifted Cistercian delighted in proclaiming God's praises in the choir and at the altar, his passion for practising holy excesses in the virtue of humility was quite as strong. His heart was often nearly rent in twain, for example, by his zealous desire to chant the Office as perfectly as possible and by an opposing impulse to sing false notes and even to break

down utterly, just to merit penances, reproaches and disgrace. A third element, moreover, added to the complexity of Fabian's problem. It was a closely guarded domestic secret that the reason why the brethren of his monastery, and particularly Father Fabian himself, sang so well was because they had growing profusely in their garden a rare variety of beans that made all who frequently ate of them superb singers. That all kinds of beans are good for the voice has been a matter of common knowledge ever since the days of Pythagoras and in monastic parlance *cantor fabacius*, a bean-eating chanter, was the highest praise you could give a melodious monk.

No one ever better deserved to be called a *cantor fabacius* than Father Fabian, whose very name indeed delicately suggested beans, for he was accustomed, with the sole object of improving the strength and quality of his voice, to confine his meager diet wholly to the monastery's peculiar kind of beans. Unhappily, however, he found their variety of that useful vegetable a singularly appetising and nourishing dish. So the difficulty poor Father Fabian had in keeping his motives sufficiently pure and lofty as he thoughtfully ate his diurnal dole of beans, was, as may be imagined, exceedingly great. For on the one hand he knew by experience that the more beans he took today the sweeter and stronger would be his voice in choir the coming night. But on the other hand, the dish was so very gratifying to the palate and so productive—Alas!—of adipose tissue that Father Fabian's spare and austere appearance was rapidly becoming a thing of the past, and what was of course immeasurably worse, the temptation to indulge in the deadly sin of gluttony was a daily peril to his soul. In his hunger for humiliations Fabian would have welcomed the first-mentioned result of his diet of beans, for his heart rejoiced at the thought of being unjustly considered an unmortified religious, but that a monk who had renounced, as he had done, all the luxuries of life at a ducal court should now succumb to the enticements of a mere dish of beans, that was truly deplorable.

What was he to do? Forswear beans forever and let the quality of his magnificent voice gradually deteriorate until the pious Faithful no longer came to hear the Divine Office chanted, and dying grandees ceased to remember the monastery in their wills? Or should poor Fabian continue his perilous fabacious diet, while his soul grew leaner and leaner and its perishable tenement waxed increasingly fat until the fell day at last dawned when this unworthy son of St. Bernard would yield like a craven to the sin of gluttony and greedily devour his mess of beans simply for their own sake, and with no pretense of thereby making his voice a fitter instrument for singing the Divine praises, thus, far worse than Esau, selling his very soul for a paltry dish of beans?

At this point, most unfortunately, the veracious chronicler of the Cistercian Order's annals breaks off his narrative and it is nowhere recorded how the sorely perplexed Father Fabian got out of his predicament. Perhaps he discovered a path of compromise that enabled him to preserve not only his heart-moving voice and purity of soul but even his renown for monastic austerity. Let us hope so. But history, unhappily, is strangely silent about all Father Fabian's subsequent career.

"Everything's got a moral, if only you can find it," little Alice's friend, the Duchess, it will be remembered, was fond of remarking. But just what lesson we should learn from the foregoing fragment of the Cistercians' chronicles is not so clear. Though few of us nowadays are ever placed in a quandary precisely like Father Fabian's, nevertheless the ancient war between the flesh and the spirit is going on still in all of Eve's family and in the highly complicated life of our modern world duties come into violent conflict far more readily, of course, than they did in the simpler, heavenward-facing thirteenth century.

There is no doubt that many vacationists of today, for instance, are firmly persuaded that their tired minds cannot get

the complete rest they need unless the entire summer is passed without reading a single serious book. Feeling, as they do, that the headlines of the daily paper, the neighboring movie-theater and the hotel-piazza conversations, fully supply all the mental food their wearied brains can assimilate, few of our summerers, it is said, expose themselves to the peril of solid reading. Indeed, perhaps the fear that they might be tempted, while away on vacation, to follow the plot and analyze the characterizations of a Victorian novel, read a play or two of Shakespeare's, renew the memory of Tennyson's lyrics or even become absorbed in a recent biography like Mr. Leslie's "Henry Edward Manning," makes them leave all such books locked up safely at home. For in August, they argue, the intellect must not be overtaxed. Why, the very word "vacation," they might say, coming as it does from the Latin verb *vacare*, to be empty, seems to indicate pretty clearly how much food and exercise the mind should have during the months of summer. Such men and women, obviously, seldom find themselves in anything like Father Fabian's dilemma, since their starving mind's feeble cries for nutriment, being quite drowned by the body's loud, insistent clamors for uninterrupted "rest and recreation," are doomed to go unheard and unheeded.

But perhaps the earthly tenements of even the most wearied August vacationist would not completely collapse under a very moderate regimen of improving reading, if the doses were only administered with great prudence. Just as no sensible person would avoid taking all solid food the whole summer long, preferring to subsist on nothing but pastry and confectionery, men and women with heads on their shoulders will not confine their summer reading exclusively to the froth and foam of literature. To some vigorous minds a mere change of occupation is vacation enough. Such people would regard devoting an entire summer to absolute mental idleness as virtually courting intellectual suicide. Many find that the long days of August really offers more leisure for reading than does any other month of the year, so they wisely use the opportunity for enriching their minds by making their own a few of the world's literary masterpieces.

Therefore to avoid the distress of soul arising from a predicament similar to Father Fabian's, the prudent August vacationist will be sure to find room in trunk or traveling-bag for a judicious selection of time-proved works from such a "guide to sound and interesting reading" as Father Reville's "Bookcase," and courageously resolve to devote a portion of each day to making their acquaintance. Thus, while the body is being refreshed the mind will also have her food, and our August vacationists will return home re-created, or made over, not only physically but intellectually as well.

WALTER DWIGHT, S.J.

THE FAILURE

He was an arrant failure, folk agree,
And, truth, he blundered on in life,
From sun to sun, with rare consistency,
Unequal to the strife.

In games his mightiest effort on the field
Only evoked a mocking jest;
His books their golden treasure would not yield
To bleeding-fingered quest.

I know his breast enshrined a heart of gold,
His word no man dared disbelieve;
But he would falter when the faltering told,
And never could achieve.

And so he plodded on and never wore
The garland men have named success,
Trying and smiling, though his heart was sore
For very weariness.

And when in autumn time, a withered leaf
Falling unheeded on the sod,
He loosed his hold on things, no cry of grief
Was heard in ways he trod.

There is no guerdon here for efforts vain.
Mere goodness lost is not a loss.
Yet honest failure He will count for gain
Who failed upon the Cross.

WILLIAM V. DOYLE, S.J.

REVIEWS

The Gospel According to Saint Mark, with Introduction, Text, and Notes. By ROBERT EATON. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$2.00.

In AMERICA for March 9, 1918, the commentary of St. Luke by Father Eaton of the Birmingham Oratory was reviewed. The present commentary is like the former. The text is that of Challoner's revision of the Rheims version. The erudition is meant for the lay reader. Hence only the books of the Bible are included on the page, which explains abbreviations. The introduction is good, despite several defects. It is not correct for instance to say that "common opinion" identifies Mark with the young man who fled naked from Gethsemani. Likelier is the witness of Papias that the Evangelist "neither heard the Lord nor followed Him." Father Eaton falls into the error of finding the style of Mark in the Marcan words of Jesus. The style of Mark is in his narrative parts; in the recitative parts, the style is that of Jesus or some other speaker. For Mark is an inspired historian. When he narrates "Jesus said," the Holy Spirit guarantees the truth that Jesus said substantially what follows. It were destructive of the historical worth of Mark to allow that he sublimated the sayings of Jesus in the alembic of his own consciousness; and then reported these transformed words in his own "most vivid and crisp" style. The notes of this commentary are illuminative and, for the most part, very correct. Old Testament references are supplied in full. New and Old Testament passages throw light on the text. History, topography, and archeology are drawn upon for information. In this commentary, as in that on St. Luke, Father Eaton neglects the law of the Church, which prohibits vernacular versions of Scripture, "unless they are edited with notes taken chiefly from the holy Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers" (Canon, 1391). No Fathers are mentioned by him. Cardinal Newman is the only Catholic writer quoted; he is only once cited. The "brothers of the Lord," the "worm of conscience" and "unquenchable fire" call for patristic citations. What few quotations are given, indicate no author. They may be from Protestant sources. Catholics may be misled by the interpretation of Mark 9: 41-48. The fire of hell may be thought of, when the author writes: "The two figures of salt and fire come before us and are intermingled." He does not mean to interpret the fire of hell figuratively.

W. F. D.

The Truth About the Treaty. By ANDRÉ TARDIEU. Foreword by EDWARD M. HOUSE. Introduction by GEORGES CLEMENCEAU. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. \$4.00.

The content of M. Tardieu's book is not so all-embracing as its title would suggest. The author is not so much concerned with the treaty as with the part France played in it and the advantages France derives from it. It might better be called the story of what M. Clemenceau and M. Tardieu accomplished for their country in the momentous conferences which took place in Paris after the signing of the armistice. Indeed the author has only one interest, the hopes and fears of Frenchmen, the claims they made, the compromises they were obliged to accept, and the measure of victory which they gained. The impression left on the reader is that M. Tardieu and his chief

did very well under the circumstances for France, and that their successors by departing from the Clemenceau methods have not done so well for her. From this point of view it is an excellent appeal to the electorate.

The book, however, will not answer the expectations of the American public. Their friendship for France makes them welcome the justification of that country's attitude on the disarmament of Germany, the left bank of the Rhine, Alsace and Lorraine, the Sarre Basin and the matter of reparations, but they will notice with regret that there is an almost absolute silence on the questions that provoked criticism of the treaty in the United States and were responsible for its rejection by the Senate. In spite of this the book is very interesting and remarkably frank. Since it was sent to the press, the Administration at Washington has given to France that political support for which M. Tardieu pleads in the last pages.

The author's references to Ireland leave a good deal to be desired both in accuracy and generosity. In speaking of the reasons for which England needs France, he says: "America will need to be told by others than the British themselves . . . that during the war the Sinn Feiners harbored and supplied German submarines and took German gold to pay for Casement's treason." When M. Tardieu sends forth his agents on this ungracious and gratuitous mission, it would be well for him to furnish them with better evidence than has yet appeared, for their mere statement in the matter will not carry conviction. No matter what may be the shortcomings of M. Tardieu's memory, the United States has not forgotten that the Irish and those of Irish extraction were in strong numbers in every English-speaking army that fought for France, and that their devotion to France was sealed by their blood.

J. H. F.

Hail Columbia! Random Impressions of a Conservative English Radical. By W. L. GEORGE. Illustrated by GEORGE WRIGHT. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.50.

This British feminist's readable and discerning book of American impressions is an agreeable surprise after the noisome novels and "sociological" works with which he has afflicted the public. In his preface the author modestly states that unlike most of our foreign visitors he is quite aware that a six months' sojourn in this country hardly qualifies him to generalize about Americans. He merely aims to give a "well-disposed interested stranger's" impressions. He went from Maine to Nebraska, from New York to Georgia, and learned the Middle West pretty well, and nearly every thing he saw he liked and praised. That America is *par excellence* the land of opportunity is, perhaps, what struck Mr. George most forcibly. He avers that in spite of all temptations to belong to other nations, if he were starting life over again he would have liked to be born an American, for

He is born to a birthright that no Western European enjoys. An English boy of seventeen knows pretty well what the future can give him. If he is born in the gentleman class and has money, he knows that he can be Prime Minister; if in the gentleman class but without money, he knows that he can hope to make ten to twenty thousand dollars a year in one of the professions, and perhaps in business; but if he is a poor boy who has gone to the national school he knows perfectly well that, barring extraordinary accidents, he will always be a small man, an employed man, a minor shopkeeper, etc. That is not the situation in America. Every boy knows that nothing need stop him, that no class bar will cut him off from any position or any office.

The author finds that in this country, besides the intellectual class and the class that does not aspire to intellect, we have a third which Europe lacks: "the class which aspires to intellectual production or understanding," which delights in using such words as "cosmic," "dynamic," "co-ordinate," "harmony," etc. He protests that he likes everybody in the United

States except the barbers and the waiters, for they do not serve; "they merely stand and wait." The lack of dignity, the freedom of manners and the familiarity in our law courts astonished Mr. George, but our prisons he commends. The multiplicity of work-saving devices we have amazes him, while the revolt of the domestic and the high wages she demands and receives keenly interest him as sociological phenomena. About the religious state of America the author says scarcely anything. Apparently he did not see, much less enter, a single church. He realizes that large masses of our population have no links whatever with England. "And among them, animating them, embodying the protest of Europe, are the Irish animated with hatred against England by all the injustice and oppression they have suffered at her hands, filled with memories of Protestant tyranny and irreconcilable with the beef-eaters, because they themselves grew up on potatoes."

W. D.

A String of Sapphires. Being Mysteries of the Life and Death of Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Put into English Rhyme for the Young and Simple by HELEN PARRY EDEN, Tertiary of the Servants of Mary. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. \$3.50.

The author of this admirable book whose "Bread and Circuses" of some years ago will be remembered, well observes in her preface: "The chief aim of education is to train the will to make heroic choices; which means, in the end, to choose the things of God and not the things of the world. Here children make up in one way what they lack in another, for children are trained mainly through memory, men mainly through understanding." Guided by the "Summa" and "Catena Aurea" of St. Thomas Aquinas and by the writings of St. Jerome and the Venerable Bede, Mrs. Eden has put into fifty delightfully rhymed cantos a life of Our Divine Lord that little children can easily commit to memory. In the prologue she says:

Like a mother, Holy Church
Gives out of Her high hoard
To us, her children, all and each
What giants on tip-toe cannot reach—
The Truth about Our Lord.

Not only Truth for her set down,
When first Her task began,
By Mark and Matthew, Luke and John,
But what is called Tradition—
That is true stories handed on
From mouth to mouth of man . . .

And every lovely word is Hers
From Ave to Amen;
She teaches when a baby looks
At Our Lord's Face in picture-books
And knows His name; and when . . .
The Deacon stands in the candle-glow
Chanting the Word of God.

After a rhythmic exposition of the treatise "*Cur Deus Homo*," Mrs. Eden begins with the Annunciation and tells the life of Our Divine Lord in four or six-line stanzas, rich in quotable verses, and ends with the Ascension. The author owns that she found the earlier and the later days of Christ's sojourn on this earth easier to describe in melodious rhymes than she found expounding His teachings. So she makes a judicious selection from Our Saviour's miracles and sermons and gets the Fathers to help her interpret them. In the appendix are some thirty pages of interesting points of erudition which the "old and sophisticated" are invited to hand on to the "young and simple." Mrs. Eden's excellent work—It is a pity its price is not lower—should be among the books of small Catholic children and if our grade-school teachers could manage to have their little pupils learn many of the author's verses by heart the time would scarcely be better spent.

W. D.

Semaine Sociale du Canada, Première Session. Montréal: Secrétariat des Semaines Sociales du Canada. \$1.50.

Die Betriebsfreiheit im Versicherungswesen, in Handel, Schifffahrt und Industrie. Von A. F. BREEDENBEEK. Amsterdam: Verlagsbuchhandlung "Messis."

The first of these two books deals with the notable Canadian social week which was held in Montreal in 1920. It offers in abstract the substance of the various papers read by men qualified to speak with authority upon the economic, social and industrial questions of the day. The volume is consequently a valuable contribution to Catholic social literature. Naturally the directors of this Canadian-French social week looked to France for their model. "*Nous nous sommes, en effet, efforcés de marcher sur vos traces*," says the Rev. Joseph Papin Archambault, S.J., chairman of the Canadian Congress, addressing the President of the *Semaines Sociales de France*, M. Eugène Duthoit. The latter, in turn, compliments Father Archambault as "*l'artisan principal de cette grande oeuvre*." It is not possible to discuss the social views of the different speakers, but attention may at least be called to the paper on "*Le Programme social des évêques américains*," by M. Edouard Montpetit, of Montreal University, who sees in the American Bishops' program, "the logic of the moral principle followed out even to its ultimate conclusion."

The second book is a translation from the Dutch of a work written by a fire-insurance specialist, who in a previous volume had strenuously combated the efforts to make of this business a State monopoly in Holland. He now deals in a more general way with the subject of State monopoly, of which he is a relentless opponent. A very local coloring is given to the work by the large space devoted to Dutch political debates, extensive criticism of *De Telegraaf* and long quotations from current Netherlands literature. "State omnipotence" is no less bitterly attacked by the author than "slavery under the protection of a League of Nations erected on a non-Christian basis." The actual League of Nations he considers to be wanting in all sane idealism, because it rests upon no religious foundations. These he rightly regards as an indispensable condition for solving aright the League's problems.

J. H.

The Hounds of Banba; The Labor Leader. A Play in Three Acts. By DANIEL CORKERY. Dublin: The Talbot Press.

Those who would drink at its source the spirit of Sinn Féinism should read the ten stories in the first of these books. Though in the form of fiction they seem to be veritable transcripts from the Irish patriot's perilous life, as it has been lived during the past two years. Mr. Corkery, besides being a faithful interpreter of his countrymen's soul, is a consummate literary artist and his book is full of beauty. "The Ember," the opening tale, relates the conversion of Old Muirish, an embittered Fenian, to the Sinn Féin movement. "Seumas" tells how adroitly a fiery young consumptive spread propaganda and how joyfully he died for his country. "Colonel MacGillicuddy Goes Home," is the account of the change wrought in an Anglo-Irish officer by England's cruelties, "The Price," tells how Nan Twohig saved the village of Ballinskey from being destroyed by the Black and Tans, "but she became a nun all the same." In "An Unfinished Symphony," the waiting police break off the romantic musings of a Republican recruiter who is "on the run." They arrest him as he is picturing his wedding with the fair Eileen MacCarthy.

We would surprise the simple people [he reflects] who were giving us so large-heartedly of their stores, of their pity, of their love. They would say: "Those Sinn Feiners—look how merry they can be—and they not knowing the night they'll be thrown into prison, or maybe shot or hanged!" Then, after five days or eight, or ten, I would take up my work again, and push ahead with it, rejoicing in those gifts of insight and tact God had given me. Yes, I would dare all and go to her.

The other book is a play which was produced two years ago in the Abbey Theater, Dublin, and which gives a faithful picture of the quaymen of Cork. David Lombard, the central figure, is secretary of the Union, and a lyrical enthusiast for the cause of Irish labor. His enemies in the Union conspire against him, but in the last act he triumphs over them all. W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The Catholic Mind.—The July 22 number of the *Catholic Mind* starts with Archbishop Mannix's farewell speech on leaving England for Australia. He said that when he gets home he will say that "Ireland is not looking for anything except what she is perfectly entitled to, Ireland for the Irish, Ireland to be ruled by the Irish." "The Women Needed Today," the subject of Judge Alfred J. Talley's address to the graduating class of the College of Mt. St. Vincent, is the second article in the issue. The re-establishment of the home, in the author's opinion, is woman's most important task nowadays. The third paper in the number is Mr. Hilaire Belloc's search for "Catholic Truth in History." It is very hard to find, he says, in the average textbook, and he shows why. "A Fresh Hunt for Primitive Man" is discredited in the concluding article of the issue.

July Fiction.—"The Education of Eric Lane" (Doran, \$1.90), by Stephen McKenna, is a further instalment of the author's study of the group which his publishers have called the "Sensationalists." Sonia is in the background but Lady Barbara, the fascinating figure in "Lady Lilith," occupies the center of the stage and is just as baffling, as charming, and as irresponsible as ever, and no less destructive of peace of soul, both her own and that of Eric Lane. The story is interesting, clever, and brilliant, but the climax is unsatisfactory, unless it is equivalently a promise of another volume.—John Buchan in "The Path of the King" (Doran, \$1.90), has written a group of very interesting stories. Adventurers and pioneers of many nations and in many climes walk through these pages strong with life and action. There is a common theme running through every tale though the plots are varied and the characters are diversified. Figures from history are the heroes and heroines and their careers are woven into a fine romantic setting. The story of Lincoln that closes the volume is one of the best and the tale of his mother one of the strongest in pathos.—The marvelous dogs that are the central figures in the eight short-stories of Albert Payson Terhune's recent book "Buff: a Collie and Other Dog Stories" (Doran, \$2.00), are made nobler beings, as a rule, than their masters, and do everything but talk. "The Foul Fancier" is the best.—"Clerambault" (Holt), which Katherine Miller has translated from the French of Romain Rolland, is called, not a novel, but "the story of an independent spirit during the war." The volume is filled with the rather tiresome reflections and reactions of a Socialist poet, whose son is killed in battle and who is shunned by his friends for writing pacifist "treason."

Long Island Villages.—Mr. Charles Hanson Towne has successfully carried out a plan he formed of walking by easy stages from Long Island City along the South Shore to Montauk Point with an agreeable companion, making "copy" out of the adventures they had and getting Thomas Fogarty to draw excellent pictures of some of the things they saw. His readable book called "Loafing Down Long Island" (Century, \$2.50), containing ten papers, including one on Coney Island and another on the North Shore, thirty-one tinted illustrations, and some graceful flights of verse ought to appeal especially to all Long Island commuters.—"The Brassbounder" (Dutton, \$2.00), the name given a British sea apprentice who "served under square sail in our early days" before steam was universal in

the merchant marine, is a new edition of a book written ten years ago by David W. Bone. He writes vividly and feelingly of what he himself saw and experienced during a voyage around the Horn from Scotland to California, describing the hardships of a sailor's life, under a cruel skipper and with a brutal crew.

Canadian Verses.—"Memories in Melody" (The Ryerson Press, Toronto), by Arthur Charles Nash, contains many musical lines. A poem in parts called "Ruth" is a successful imitation of "Maud" and the following sonnet on "Friendship" represents the author's best work:

If I could find one great, high-minded soul
With nature of a peerless purity,
Whose vision has the breadth of the wide sea,
Who gazes god-like on the varied whole
Of man and nature, and whose spirit deep,
Fed from a source beyond my power to know,
Tho' oft receiving, yet will all bestow,
Can with me joy, or with my sadness weep;
Yet, tho' the years should ripen, and the view,
In rich companionship of life, should spread,
While ever lovelier vistas, old and new,
Entrance my soul as onward I am led,
Knowing that Love transcends mortality,
Could I not glimpse the glory yet to be!

Central Society's Pamphlets.—A short pamphlet deserving of special attention is Father Muntz's "Infant Mortality and Nursing by the Mother" (Central Society, Temple Building, St. Louis, \$0.10), based upon an important work from the pen of the eminent scientist, Hermann Muckermann, S.J. Chapters of this book, we are told, were read into the proceedings of the German Parliament. Father Muntz does more than offer an excellent summary of the information given here. He adds ample statistical matter gathered from various reliable American sources. The thesis clearly proved by both writers is that: "The neglect of mothers to nurse their offspring during the first year of infancy is one of the chief factors not only in bringing many an innocent babe to an untimely grave, but also in handicapping the child seriously for life." The pamphlet should be brought to the attention of mothers and nurses, and can well be used in addresses to mothers' organizations.—The four-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the modern apostle of Germany, the man who accomplished more than any other in stemming the tide of Protestantism, gives timeliness to the carefully prepared historical brochure on "Blessed Peter Canisius" (\$0.20) by the Rev. Francis S. Betten, S.J.—The Central Bureau of the Central Society places Catholics under further obligation by its free sixteen-page leaflet, "The New Towner Bill (H. R. 7)." The Bureau offers adequate explanation of the new bill, showing it to be "every bit as objectionable as its predecessors." The entire matter is presented in a clear and satisfactory manner, while the insincerity or falsehood connected with the present propaganda is relentlessly exposed. Catholics should wisely avail themselves of this new weapon in their fight for freedom of education.

Short Biographies.—"A Woman of the Bentivoglios" (Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, \$0.75), by Gabriel Francis Powers, is a very readable little life of Mother Mary Magdalen (Countess Annette Bentivoglio), foundress of the Poor Clares in this country. With the blessing of Pope Pius IX, Mother Magdalen and her sister Constance landed in the United States, October 12, 1875, with the object of starting here a convent of Poor Clares of the strict observance, but the two nuns had to undergo many hardships before they found in Mr. John Creighton of Omaha, a benefactor who would give them a permanent home. Subsequently they opened another convent in Evansville, Ind., where Mother Magdalen made a holy end in 1905.—"In the Shadow

of the Cloister," a handsome brochure published by the Sisters of the Precious Blood, Manchester, New Hampshire, is a sketch of the foundress of this Congregation, Mother Catherine Aurélie. She was born in St. Hyacinth, Quebec, in 1833, founded her austere community to adore the Precious Blood and to make reparation by prayer and penance, in 1861, and died in 1905. The institute now counts fifteen monasteries of which eleven are in Canada, one in Havana, Cuba, and one each in Portland, Oregon, Manchester and Brooklyn. An extended life of this remarkable woman is now in course of preparation. Its circulation should do much to promote devotion to the Precious Blood and to foster vocations to the cloistered life, never so much needed as at the present day, among our young people.—"A Joyful Herald of the King of Kings" (Herder, \$1.35), is the title of Father F. M. Dreves' account of Blessed Théophane Vénard's career. The book contains seven other stories or sketches calculated to foster vocations to the foreign missions.—A Georgetown Visitation Nun, Sister Mary Paulina, has translated from the Italian the biography of "Sister Benigna Consolata Ferrero, a Professed Choir Nun of the Order of the Visitation, B. V. M., Como, Italy" (Georgetown Visitation Convent, 35th St., Wash., \$0.75), who died five years ago at the age of thirty-one after a life of extraordinary holiness. The appropriateness of the book's subtitle, "The Tenderness of the Love of Jesus for a Little Soul," is shown by the highly intimate mystical union this maiden enjoyed for twelve years with Our Divine Lord, revelations Sister Benigna's superiors now sponsor by publishing this book.

EDUCATION

Some Documents on the School Question

IN response to numerous inquiries, it has been thought well to reprint extracts from various official decisions outlining the attitude which every loyal Catholic must maintain toward public education and the public school. It need not be said that Catholics entertain no deep-laid dark-lantern plot against the State system of education. They are not ashamed to present their principles in public. In fact, they believe that these principles stated perhaps in other terms, find favor with that large body of non-Catholics, daily increasing, who are convinced that upon the religious instruction of our young people depends the future well-being of the State.

THE SYLLABUS

FIRST in order of time, not to go back beyond the nineteenth century, are the famous Condemned Propositions cited in the Syllabus of Pius IX, dated December 8, 1864.

"45. The exclusive control of the public schools in which the young of any Christian State are educated (the Seminaries of the Bishops alone, in some degree, excepted) can and should pertain to the civil power; and to such an extent that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, in the courses of study, in the conferring of degrees, and in the choice and approbation of teachers.

"47. The best theory of civil society demands that the public schools (*scholae populares*), that is, schools open to all classes of children, and, in general, all public institutions intended for instruction in letters and philosophy and for conducting the education of youth, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, superintendence and interference, and should be subjected to the complete control of the civil and political power, in conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the time.

"48. Catholics can approve of a system of education which is separated from the Catholic Faith and the power of the Church, and which concerns itself with the knowledge of merely natural things, and only, or at least primarily, with the ends of social life."

These propositions are rejected as "errors and pernicious doctrines reprobated and condemned" by the Holy See.

THE "INSTRUCTION" OF 1875

THE observations and decrees of the Second and Third Councils of Baltimore come next in order. They are withheld, however, to give place to the lengthy "Instruction Concerning the Public Schools Addressed to the Bishops in North America" by the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, November 24, 1875.

"Often and again has the Sacred Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* been informed that the greatest evils imminently threaten Catholic youth in the schools called public, in the United States of America. By reason of this sad intelligence the aforesaid Sacred Congregation has thought proper to propose to the most honored Bishops of that country certain questions which referred partly to the reasons why the Faithful permit their children to frequent non-Catholic schools, partly to the means by which youths may be made to avoid such schools. Now, the answers given by the said Bishops were referred, as the nature of the business demanded, to the Supreme Congregation *Universalis Inquisitionis* and the affair having been diligently examined on Wednesday, June 30, 1875, it was determined by the most Eminent Fathers that the matter should be summed up in the following Instruction, which, thereupon, our most Holy Lord [Pius IX] designed to approve and confirm on Wednesday, November 24, of the same year.

"And, first, the system itself of instructing youth which is proper and peculiar to these schools, must be considered. This system the Sacred Congregation considers by its nature to be fraught with danger and very hostile to Catholicism. For, since the system of such schools excludes all teaching of religion, the pupils neither learn in them the rudiments of Faith, nor are instructed in the precepts of the Church; hence they will be deprived of the knowledge most necessary to man, knowledge without which a Christian life is impossible. Now, in these schools youths are instructed from their childhood, not to say from very infancy: at an age in which, as is evident, the seeds of virtue and vice take most tenacious root. Assuredly, it is an immense evil that such tender children should grow up without religion. . . .

"Now, if this proximate danger of perversion be not remote, such schools cannot be frequented with a safe conscience. This the natural as well as the Divine law proclaims.

ESTABLISH PARISH SCHOOLS

"THE Sovereign Pontiff [Pius IX] declared this in plain words when writing to a former Archbishop of Friburg, July 14, 1864: 'For, certainly, in whatsoever places or countries, wherever this most pernicious design of expelling from the schools the authority of the Church is undertaken or carried into effect thereby exposing youth to loss of faith, the Church should not only endeavor with most pressing importunity and spare no pains to obtain for youth the necessary training and education, but it is also obliged to warn all the Faithful and declare to them that such schools, hostile to the Catholic Church, cannot in conscience be frequented.'

"These words, founded as they are on natural and Divine law, enunciate a general principle, and are of universal application in all countries in which this most pernicious system of instructing youth shall unhappily have been introduced. The most honored prelates must by all means therefore use every possible endeavor to protect the flock committed to them, from all contagion of the public schools.

"For this purpose, as all agree, there is nothing so necessary as that Catholics should everywhere have schools of their own, and in these in no wise inferior to the public schools. No pains, therefore, are to be spared to found Catholic schools where they are wanting; to enlarge and equip and arrange them more and more perfectly, that they may be put on an equality with the public schools, both in their teaching and management.

"For the fulfilling of so holy and necessary a design, members of religious societies, both men and women, may, at the discretion of the Bishop, be usefully employed. That, however, the expenses necessary for so great a work may be the more willingly and abundantly supplied by the Faithful, they will need to be seriously admonished by public sermons or private conversations, as occasion offers, that they will seriously neglect their duty unless, at all possible sacrifices, they furnish the means of supporting Catholic schools. On this point those especially must be admonished who are preeminent among their fellow-Catholics on account of wealth and influence with the people, as well as those who are elected to the legislature. In the country in question no civil law prevents Catholics from educating their children if they please, at their own schools, in all knowledge and piety. The Catholic people are therefore happily in a position to avert the injury with which the public schools threaten Catholicism.

CATHOLIC CHILDREN IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

"LET all be convinced it is for their greatest interest, not only as individuals and members of families, but also as citizens of that most flourishing American nation, which affords such grounds of hope to the Church, that religion and piety should not be expelled from their schools.

"On the other hand, the Sacred Congregation is not ignorant that sometimes circumstances are such that Catholic parents may conscientiously commit their children to the public schools. But this they cannot do unless for so acting they have a sufficient reason, and whether in any particular case, such sufficient reason does or does not exist must be left to the conscience and judgment of the Bishops. And, according to what is herein detailed, this reason will generally be judged to exist when either there is no Catholic school in the place, or the school at hand is but little fitted to give the children an education suited to their condition and circumstance.

"But that any public schools may be frequented conscientiously, the danger of perversion, more or less inherent in the very system itself must—by means of fitting preventives and precautions—be changed from proximate to remote.

"It is therefore first to be considered whether, in the schools, to which there is question of sending the child, the danger of perversion be of such a kind that it cannot possibly be made remote, as is the case wherever things are taught or done that are contrary to Catholic doctrine or to good morals; and which cannot be even listened to, much less done, without hurt to the soul. For, such danger, as is self-evident, must be altogether avoided at every risk, even of life itself.

"That, then, children may conscientiously be permitted to attend (any) public school, they must, at least, outside of school hours, be given diligently and properly the necessary Christian training and education. Wherefore, pastors and missionaries, mindful of the most opportune regulations of the Council of Baltimore in this matter, must be zealous in teaching catechism, and while explaining it insist particularly on those truths of faith and morals which are more frequently attacked by infidels and heretics; not failing with diligent care to fortify youths exposed to so many dangers, by inculcating the frequent use of the Sacraments, as well as piety towards the Blessed Virgin; and never ceasing in their endeavors to make them cling firmly to their religion. Let parents, or those who hold their place, watch carefully over their children, and either in person, or if less capable themselves, through others, ask them about their lessons, see what books they are studying; and if they discover therein anything hurtful, provide remedies; and, finally, prohibit and prevent their children from the familiarity and company of fellow-students, from whom danger to their faith or morals is to be feared, or who are corrupting their morals.

A DUTY BINDING IN CONSCIENCE

"BUT all parents who neglect to give their children this necessary training and education; or who permit their children to frequent schools in which the ruin of souls cannot be avoided; or, finally, who having in their locality a good Catholic school, properly appointed to teach their children; or having the opportunity of educating their offspring in another place, nevertheless send them to public schools, without sufficient reason and without the necessary precautions by which the proximate danger may be made remote; these, as is evident from Catholic moral teaching, if they are contumacious, cannot be absolved in the Sacrament of Penance."

Extracts from other important documents will be given in the following issue.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

A Study in Contrast

IN March, 1917, the war-clouds began to gather. It was apparent that we would soon "have to go in." The hard-pressed Allies had sent their representatives to Washington. They had sought and secured material aid, but what they needed more than all else was the human contribution; men, fathers, brothers, sons. People began to realize that the war was near, that it was coming into their very homes, into the family circle.

In a modest home in the little Massachusetts town of Woburn, a mother was thinking about these things. She was a Christian woman, deeply religious, and she had reared her children in the knowledge, the worship and love of God. Her son Charlie was only seventeen years old. But she knew and he knew that when the call came he would volunteer for service abroad. He was that kind of a boy, one who would perform his whole duty, saving himself not at all. So she waited and the days passed, and the time of parting came nearer.

THE MOTION-PICTURE MAGNATE

THERE was another house in Woburn. It was not a home.

It was conducted by a woman of disreputable character for evil purposes. On March 6, 1917, just one month before the breaking of the storm which made havoc in so many God-fearing homes throughout the country, this house was the scene of an orgy, staged by men who "could pay well." About fifteen men, many of whom had made fortunes in the motion-picture, had gathered there for a night of revelry. Later it was described as "that drunken party" and in other terms which need not be repeated here.

During the following months these men were seeking by payment of an immense sum of money to stifle publicity, to prevent threatened indictments, and to satisfy the alleged claims of injured parties. One of these men is internationally known as a leader among the motion-picture producers of the United States.

We have heard—from their own spokesmen—what the prominent motion-picture producers did for the country during the war. But did any of them volunteer for military service at the front? Did any of them sacrifice a dollar? Did any of them pay out insurance-premiums, and buy liberty bonds to the extent that they had but a few dollars left each month for their own use? Did any of them suffer one moment of bodily discomfort, or sleep in the mud under a pup-tent, or go through the terror of poison-gas, aerial-bombs, bursting shells, and shrapnel and machine-gun fire? Well, little Charlie Lynch, blue-eyed, light-haired, cheerful, and morally straight, did all of that, and paid the glorious price. For just about the time that the orgiasts of Woburn were fleeing from justice, Charlie Lynch, true to the standards of duty which his good mother had instilled in him, had volunteered for military service. He

was accepted, and became a member of Company F, 101st Infantry, of the famous Twenty-six division of the New England militia.

THE CHRISTIAN PATRIOT

I MET him first at Vertuzey in France, on the Toul front. On May 14, 1918, his battalion came back from their tour of duty in the trenches for a few days' rest. He was a great favorite in the company. His character impressed itself upon his comrades. His best friend was a Catholic priest, the chaplain of his regiment, and when impromptu services would be held in the old French village church, his clear, boyish voice led the others in the sacred music of the volunteer choir. For only nine days I knew him, but I knew him intimately, for we were together almost continuously during that brief space. He assisted me in my work, trying to help maintain the morale of the command. And then on May 22, he went forward again, bearing his heavy pack, his rifle and all the other paraphernalia, but light-hearted and cheerful. Generous and helpful, he was an inspiration to all.

On May 27, I was at Grosrouvres. At two o'clock in the morning heavy firing began, which lasted until a quarter to four. There was some gas. It was apparent that something serious was on foot. About nine o'clock word came that the trenches, just taken over by Company F, had been shelled. Among the dead were Sweeney, Rupp and—Lynch. Still volunteering, Charlie had taken a tour at patrol which he did not have to take, and a shell bursting directly overhead had killed him and his two companions. On the following evening the supply company brought back the pitiful evidences of the violence of their death; a broken gun, a helmet pierced, and other pieces of damaged accoutrement, stained with the life-blood of these unmentioned heroes.

RELIGIOUS TRAINING

IT was a wonderful division, that Twenty-sixth. I came in contact with thousands of men of the 101st, 102nd and 104th infantry regiments, but none so impressed me for manliness, soldierly deportment, and Christian character as little Charlie Lynch, who at the age of eighteen gave his life for his friends and for his country.

I have never visited Woburn, but Charlie Lynch, through his character, gave me an impression of that New England town, of its family life and soul-satisfying religious training that will never be effaced. In fancy, I can now see his mother kneeling before the figure of her Crucified Saviour, praying with all her heart to God for the repose of the soul of her little soldier-son.

And now the name of Woburn is dragged in the dust through the conduct of certain worshipers of mammon in search of licentiousness. What are its citizens going to do to atone for this blot cast upon the home of Charlie Lynch?

JOHN S. SUMNER,

Secretary, New York Society for the Prevention of Vice.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The End of a Silent Life

HERR ALBERT HORN who for forty-four years was the Catholic representative for Neissee in the Reichstag died this month in his eighty-first year. After twenty years' membership in the Reichstag his party leaders prevailed upon him to ask the Government to give an answer to an interpellation by the Center party. He was instructed to say: "I propose that the Government should answer the interpellation." But the London Catholic News Service reports that he was so unaccustomed

to the sound of his own voice that he actually said: "I propose that the Government should interpellate the answer." He never spoke again. Readers of the *Congressional Record* will appreciate the value of his services to his country. Had he been an American representative Government printers would doubtless have petitioned Congress to award him the Congressional medal.

The Catholic Congress of Guatemala

ACCORDING to the Catholic News Service of London, a congress of all Latin-American Catholic Associations is to take place very soon in Guatemala City. Its purpose is to unify religious action in the Latin-American Republics. There is a movement on foot in Guatemala City to combat the immoral movie. A new moving-picture company has been formed that secures decent films through a Catholic cinematograph company in London. This company was founded a few years ago by a group of ex-army officers.

The Manufacture of Sacramental Wine

THE question of procedure in the purchase of sacramental wine came up for discussion recently in a North Carolina Court. The case in question was reported by the *Raleigh Times* as follows:

John Sears, a Franklin County churchman was charged with the manufacture of grape and watermelon wine on his premises. He admitted the charge and explained that he made the wine for use in his church which has a membership of about 500 worshipers. The Prohibition agent found about seven gallons at Sears' home. Judge Henry Conner asked Attorney Aydlott for some pointers on the law relating to the use of wine for sacramental purposes. The judge wanted the information for the defendant's knowledge. "I know it is against the law but wondered what kind of procedure is required," said the judge.

The defendant produced a paper signed by influential citizens giving him an excellent character. He was fined \$10 and costs and warned not to make any more wine for sacramental purposes.

"Stop-My-Copy" Mentality

WHEN a seventeen years' subscriber of the *Bombay Examiner* asked to have his copy stopped because a long account of a trivial family anniversary which he had sent to the paper was not published, Father Hull grew reflective and jotted down the following characteristics of the "stop-my-copy" type of subscriber:

(1) The editor must insert in his paper anything which I take a fancy to send him, or else I shall order him to stop my copy. (2) If the editor does insert anything I send, he must insert it wholly, verbatim and at once, otherwise I shall stop my copy. (3) The editor must never express any view contrary to mine on any point in which I feel keenly interested; otherwise I stop my copy. (4) He must not even reproduce from other papers any news-item or expression of opinion contrary to mine on such subjects—otherwise I stop my copy. (5) The manager must never remind me that my subscription has fallen into arrears, no matter how far. If he does I must stop my copy. (6) If I make any complaint against the despatching staff, that my copy did not arrive, or my postcard was not attended to, the office must at once acknowledge the mistake and apologize profusely for it. If on the contrary the manager clears his office from blame and makes no apology, then there is only one course: I must stop my copy.

In his analysis of his quondam subscriber's mentality, Father Hull wondered whether his aggrieved correspondent really imagines that "anyone merely by paying his subscription thereby acquires a sort of proprietary right over the paper, with power to put into it whatever he likes," or whether the high impor-

tance he attaches to his own private affairs and opinions "is the objective measure of this importance in the eyes of the universe?" "They do! Alas! They do!" every editor of experience will feelingly exclaim.

The Break in Zionist Ranks

THE *American Israelite* editorially comments on the recent break in the Zionist movement as follows:

Weizmann has made the matter very clear. "There is no bridge between Washington and Pinsk." The East European and the American interpretation of the Jew's place in the State are irreconcilable. Therefore political Zionism which squares with the East European interpretation and true Americanism are irreconcilable. Philanthropic Zionism, agricultural Zionism, economic Zionism, humanitarian Zionism and the other varieties which have been used as camouflage of the real Zionism, political in its essence and intent, have been exposed by Weizmann for what they are. He has declared emphatically that Zionists cannot march under two flags. *Aut, aut.* Either a simon-pure political Zionist, or an American political assimilationist. He has made the issue very clear. He has dispelled the haze of what he has called the lack of thought of the American Zionist leaders: "These gentlemen do not know; they do not think very much," he has declared apodictically. He has read out of Zionism all such as do not give political Zionism an undivided allegiance, a single-minded loyalty.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann declared that the leaders of the American Zionist movement are not Zionists at all. A majority vote of the delegates at the convention of the Federation of American Zionists recently held at Cleveland, sustained his contention and repudiated the officials.

The American Classical League and the High School

THE American Classical League is engaged in its first big undertaking, the investigation of the teaching of the Latin and Greek classics in secondary schools. The purpose of the investigation is to remedy what defects may be found in the present methods of instruction. Three years will be allowed for the investigation which will be financed by the General Education Board. Speaking at the second annual meeting of the League which was held this year on July 7 at the University of Pennsylvania, Vice-President Coolidge advocated the cultural value of the classics and their worth in training for leadership. The Vice-President summed up his message to educators by saying:

Unless Americans shall continue to live in something more than the present, to be moved by something more than material gains, they will not be able to respond to the requirements of great sacrifices, and they will go down as other people have gone down before some nation possessed of a greater moral force.

The League is frank in acknowledging the service rendered by Catholic schools in classical education. It is anxious for the cooperation of Catholic educators but as yet few Catholic teachers have joined the League. The League is not exclusive and for Catholic teachers to hold aloof is a mistake. It is only by a union of forces such as the League purposes that the cause of classical education can gain a respectful hearing.

Freemasonry in England and Ireland

A REVIEW of Dr. Wichtl's book on Freemasonry in the June *Studies* brings out some interesting facts about Masonic activities in England and Ireland. Commenting on Dr. Wichtl's statement that "English Freemasonry is essentially different in one way from Freemasonry in other countries; it does not work for revolution at home; on the contrary it places itself entirely at the service of the English State that it may be better able to help on revolution elsewhere," the reviewer remarks:

Those who know anything of England's political action in Spain, Italy, Sicily, Austria and America since the early years of the eighteenth century will agree with Dr. Wichtl. English Freemasonry he proceeds to tell us is the most powerful Masonic organization in the world. According to the returns of 1918 there are in London alone 729 Lodges, in the provinces 1,749; abroad and in the Colonies 677, all affiliated to the United Grand Lodge of England and numbering altogether 450,000 "Brothers."

Here in Ireland, Masons who number about 18,000 would seem to be Home Rulers of a kind; they owe allegiance to the Grand Lodge of Ireland alone, with headquarters in the Freemasons' Hall, Molesworth Street, Dublin, and about 510 affiliated Lodges. Dr. Wichtl tells us nothing of the influence which the "Brothers" exercise in Ireland. Some day it is to be hoped, their history will be published; and our people will then realize what they do not realize at present, how we Irish Catholics have suffered at the hands of Irish Freemasonry.

Dr. Wichtl's book, "*Weltfreimaurerei, Weltrevolution, Weltrepublik*" was published in the middle of 1919 and caused a sensation in Austria-Germany. It went through five editions before the end of the year. Its seventh edition appeared in the spring of 1920. The Lodges have attacked it but no complete refutation of its charges and statements has yet appeared.

The Moslem and Christianity

IS the conversion of the Moslem to be seriously considered? Dealing with this subject the editor of the *Catholic Magazine for South America* can see no reason why this cannot be accomplished if we but possess the two requisites: knowledge and patience. Steps, he believes, are being made in the direction of a higher Faith by Mohammedan writers themselves, who have come into contact with Christian life. Students of St. Thomas, he says, have only to remember the respectful consideration shown by this great Catholic Doctor to the Arabian philosophers to recognize the real relations existing between Moslems and Christians.

The hopeful factor in Mohammedanism is the fact that it is a rudimentary form of Christianity. It is in the same position as some of the earlier heresies that the Church condemned. The sources of the Koran, which embodies the main teachings of the Prophet of Islam, are three: the traditions of the Arabian tribes in the midst of which he was born; and such fragments of Judaism and Christianity as he has picked up from Jewish and Christian travelers in the caravans that passed into Arabia. We also know that Mohammed went several times across the Jordan and saw the Jews in their own homes.

We are able to give a meed of praise to Mohammed for one great achievement. The tribes from whom his early ideas of religion were imbibed were idolaters. His genius led him to grasp firmly the doctrine that there was only one God, which he learned from both Jews and Christians. This he so vividly impressed upon his followers that, when he died, he had abolished idolatry among his people and had established the firm belief in the unity of an Omnipotent God.

Another unquestionable ground of hope may be found in the admiring references to Our Lord and His Blessed Mother which occur in the Koran, and in the many sound ideas about fundamental notions of prayer and sacrifice. No one can doubt that the Moslem is nearer to the truth than are the many followers of fad religions which have become popular today. Nothing so arouses the antagonism of the Moslems, says the writer in the South African review, as the accusations against them which they know to be untrue. Argumentation must begin with an acknowledgment of the truth which they already possess. To the methods of journalists and politicians the editor opposes the Christian methods: preaching, charity and patience, quoting the words of St. James: "The husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, patiently bearing till he receive the early and the latter rain." The gentle rain of God's grace comes in its own season. The Moslem is not excluded.